October 1967

EDITORIAL

The Path of Satyagraha: II

NEVILLE BRAYBROOKE

Voices in the Desert

A Dialogue between C. G. Jung and Teilhard de Chardin

SUJITKUMAR MUKHOPADHYAYA

The Quintessence of the *Shunyata* Doctrine

ARTHUR L. HERMAN

The Nature of Aesthetic Judgement: I

BOOKS REVIEWED INCLUDE

The Tenth Man; *The Symphony of Life*; *Zen—Way to Enlightenment*; *The Psychology of Time*; *Homage to Guru Gobind Singh*; *Paul Blanchard on Vatican II*; *Anton Mesmer*; *Animals in Splendour*; *Akalaṅka's Criticism of Dharmakīrti*

complete CONTENTS within

THE ARYAN PATH

VOLUME XXXVIII - NO. 10

oint out the 'Way'
owever dimly and lost among the host —
does the Evening Star
those who tread their path in darkness.

Editor:
SOPHIA WADIA

RECENT EDITIONS OF

THEOSOPHICAL BOOKS

		Rs.	*U.S.$*	*s.d.*
Vernal Blooms	by W. Q. JUDGE	4·50	1·75	7/-
Theosophical articles on spiritual discipline and occultism				
Bhagavad-Gita	by W. Q. JUDGE	2·50	0·90	4/3
A rendering from the Sanskrit				
Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita	by W. Q. JUDGE completed by ROBERT CROSBIE	3·25	1.25	5/-
Yoga Aphorisms of Patanjali	by W. Q. JUDGE	2·00	0·75	4/-
An interpretation—by translation and commentary				
Echoes from the Orient	by W. Q. JUDGE	1.75	0·65	3/6
Introductory essays on Theosophical teachings				
The Dhammapada		2.00	0·75	4/-
The Cunningham Press translation of the Buddhist classic				
Universal Theosophy	by ROBERT CROSBIE	3·00	1·00	4/6
His Theosophical talks and lectures on religion, philosophy, ethics, and spiritual life				

PUBLISHERS: Theosophy Company (India) Private Ltd.
Theosophy Hall, 40 New Marine Lines, Bombay 1

THE ARYAN PATH

Editor: SOPHIA WADIA
Assistant Editor: Rameshchandra Sirkar

CONTRIBUTIONS

The Editor is responsible for unsigned contributions only and is not necessarily in agreement with the views of the contributors, to whom free expression of opinion is given

SUBSCRIPTIONS

THE ARYAN PATH is published monthly. Subscriptions are annual, but may begin with any desired month. Orders, accompanied by the appropriate remittance, should be sent to the Editorial and Business Office, Bombay, or the London Office

RATES

	Single Copy	Annual Subscription
INDIA	Re. 1.25	Rs. 12.00
EUROPE	1*s.* 9*d.*	18*s.* (or equivalent)
THE AMERICAS	50 cents	$5.00 (or equivalent)

OFFICES

EDITORIAL & BUSINESS OFFICE	Theosophy Hall, 40 New Marine Lines Bombay 1
LONDON OFFICE	62 Queen's Gardens, London w. 2

Available in the U.S.A. from	Eastern News Distributors 155, West 15th Street, New York N.Y. 10011, U.S.A.

THE ARYAN PATH: VOL. XXXVIII · NO. 10

October 1967

EDITOR	The Path of *Satyāgraha*: II	437
FRIEDRICH V. LUSTIG	The One Who Never Spoke Amiss (Poem)	441
NEVILLE BRAYBROOKE	Voices in the Desert: A Dialogue between C. G. Jung and Teilhard de Chardin	442
P. NAGARAJA RAO	The Middle Way (*Madhyama Mārga*)	450
SUJITKUMAR MUKHOPADHYAYA	The Quintessence of the *Śūnyatā* Doctrine	454
ARTHUR L. HERMAN	The Nature of Aesthetic Judgement: I: Objective and Subjective Criteria of Beauty	457
HERBERT BLUEN	The Poet (Poem)	463
H. SUNDER RAO	The Theme of Redemption in *King Lear*	464
WILLIAM EWART WALKER	The Egotist (Poem)	468
	NEW BOOKS AND OLD	
B. V. NARAYANA REDDY	"The Tenth Man"	469
L. T. C. ROLT	A Review of Philosophy	470
	and reviews by	
	HILLA C. VAKEEL, TERENCE WHITE GERVAIS, K. E. PARTHASARATHY, EUGENE ROLFE, GOPI GAUBA, MARCUS WARD, PHYLLIS G. CROFT, R. H. WARD, K. KRISHNAMOORTHY, AND N. A. NIKAM	471
G. M.	The Tragedy of Viet Nam	479
	ENDS AND SAYINGS	480
...	Pioneers in Co-partnership	482

THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way" — however dimly, and
lost among the host — as does the evening star
to those who tread their path in darkness.

— *The Voice of the Silence*

VOL. XXXVIII OCTOBER 1967 No. 10

The Path of Satyagraha

[This is the second and concluding part of the contribution originally made to the volume *Mahatma Gandhi: Essays and Reflections on His Life and Work,* edited by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan for presentation to Gandhiji on his seventieth birthday, 2 October 1939, and published in the same year by George Allen and Unwin of London. The first part appeared last month.—ED.]

II

NOW the technique of overcoming our imperfections so that the latent perfection may become manifest is given by Gandhiji in this injunction: "Develop conscious non-violence that is latent in every one of us." Note the implication — that which is latent has to be made patent by effort. How is this effort to be made?

> If man has a divine mission to fulfil, a mission that becomes him, it is that of *Ahiṁsā* (Non-Violence). Standing as he does in the midst of *Hiṁsā* (Violence) he can retire into the innermost depths of his heart and declare to the world around him that his mission in this world of *Hiṁsā* (Violence) is *Ahiṁsā* (Non-Violence); and only to the extent that he practises it does he adorn his kind. Man's nature then is not *Hiṁsā* but *Ahiṁsā*, for he can speak from experience his innermost conviction that he is not the body but *Ātman*, and that he may use the body only with a view to self-realization.

But this resolve has to be sustained. When a person retires within, he finds both good and evil. The two minds, *Vohu-Mano* and *Akem-Mano* of Zoroastrianism, are at work in him. A man's own conscience will not suffice, though it is an aspect of the Spirit within. Gandhiji rightly says, "Conscience is not the same thing for all." What then shall be man's light to aid his conscience? An infallible Pope? A revealed scripture? In what may be called a key-passage in his writings Gandhiji says:

> I claim to have no infallible guidance or inspiration. So far as my

> experience goes, the claim to infallibility on the part of a human being would be untenable, seeing that inspiration too can come only to one who is free from the action of pairs of opposites, and it will be difficult to judge on a given occasion whether the claim to freedom from pairs of opposites is justified. The claim to infallibility would thus always be a most dangerous claim to make. This, however, does not leave us without any guidance whatsoever. The sum-total of the experiences of the sages of the world is available to us and would be for all time to come. Moreover there are not many fundamental truths, but there is only one fundamental Truth, which is Truth itself, otherwise known as Non-Violence. Finite human beings shall never know in its fullness Truth and Love, which is in itself infinite. But we do know enough for our guidance. We shall err, and sometimes grievously, in our application. But man is a self-governing being and self-government necessarily includes the power as much to commit errors as to set them right as often as they are made.

Has Gandhiji made mistakes? All do. But — what is the vital factor in the committing of blunders? All men err, but how many have the power to discern their errors? And more — how many have the courage of will to acknowledge them? One of the signs that Gandhiji is an integrated being is his habit of candid acknowledgement of his mistakes. Another is his fearless exposure of the foibles of his followers, or the slips of the members of his household, or the weaknesses of the political party to which he belongs. He is not afraid of pointing out their religious degradation to his co-religionists. Why should a man be afraid of calling a powerful imperial government "satanic" when he does not hesitate to expose himself publicly by writing about the satanic forces in his own blood, as he has done in his *Story of My Experiments with Truth*?

Also, in the above key-passage we come upon his conception of self-government. A man governing his own being is the highest type of reformer. This concept is the base of Gandhiji's philosophy. Economic reform, political reform, social reform, religious reform, are but extensions of individual reform. For example, of the most concrete type of reform — the economic — he says: "Indian economic independence means to me the economic uplift of every individual, male and female, by his or her own conscious effort."

This conscious effort involves man's relationship to the society in which he lives. The nationalistic aspect of this economic problem is set forth in a striking way. He adds:

> Real socialism has been handed down to us by our ancestors who taught, "All land belongs to Gopal. Where then is the boundary line? Man is the maker of that line and he can therefore unmake it." Gopal

literally means shepherd; it also means God. In modern language it means the State, i.e., the people. That the land today does not belong to the people is too true. But the fault is not in the teaching. It is in us who have not lived up to it.

The relationship between the individual and the society in which he lives and which he affects is a family relationship. "There is no reason to believe that there is one law for families, and another for nations." Therefore a very practical and highly important rule of public action is given thus: "Every instance of public *Satyāgraha* should be tested by imagining a parallel domestic case."

In other words, in dealing with public affairs the individual must look upon the entire human kingdom as his own family. What then shall the ideal *Gṛhastha*-gentleman, who desires to practise *Noblesse Oblige,* do with thieves, ruffians, parasites, and the like? What shall Aryan-noble nations do with dictators and haters? The answer is: Make a revolution "without the element of violence in it." Shall a person or a nation allow the bully to walk over him or it? In answering this pertinent question Gandhiji has served and is serving the whole of humanity. How?

The variety of situations which arise is innumerable; even in family relationships the practice of Non-violence requires knowledge. How to handle any particular situation according to the applied science of *Satyāgraha*? This is no easy matter, as those who have tried it even for a short period will testify. Far more intricate is the task of a nation which plans to live and to thrive on the basis of Non-violence or *Satyāgraha.* In meeting situations as they arose in South Africa and as they have arisen in India, Gandhiji has been developing the technique of resisting evil with virtue, of meeting the mailed fist with the heart of peace. Not only in known public affairs but in private and personal life also, week by week, in actual work, Gandhiji has been showing how to turn the Wheel of *Satyāgraha,* of which his favourite spinning-wheel is but a material manifestation.

The culture of our modern age is not, cannot be, sympathetic to Non-violence or *Satyāgraha.* But the failure of modern civilization is writ large, and thoughtful reformers acknowledge that if our civilization is to be salvaged, many of its old ways of doing things, its modes and its methods of life, must be abandoned.

What shall such people do?

Begin to study in theory the science of *Satyāgraha* and, having obtained a clear mental perception, begin to discipline themselves. Three are the forces of evil — not in the world only, but in the individual primarily. *Kāma* — Lust; *Krodha* — Anger; *Lobha* — Greed: these flourish in the

world because they thrive among the nations dividing that world. In each nation they create havoc of class- and caste-warfare; but their real root is in the individual. A man cannot be at peace with the world when within himself these forces are active, destroying his own peace, throwing his mind into confusion, hardening his heart against most members of the human kingdom, if not against all.

The central quality which is ever the principle of conduct of every true *Satyāgrahi* is Courage. Not only is that courage to be used in facing one's own lower nature, but also against the temptations which come from a world where lust is mistaken for love, and greed flourishes as a necessary force in the competition of life; where the fittest to survive are the successful competitors who use the force of wrath, however subtly disguised, against their opponents. At every turn we need the Courage of the Soul that proceeds from our identification with the Spirit within, which is one with the Spirit of the Universe.

Not a coward's path is that of a *Satyāgrahi*. So strongly is this brought out by Gandhiji that it is well that we should quote him on this point, which has confused many Westerners. He has written:

> I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honour than that she should in a cowardly manner become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour.
>
> If we do not know how to defend ourselves, our women and our places of worship by the force of suffering, i.e., non-violence, we must, if we are men, be at least able to defend all these by fighting.

Some time ago, answering some Chinese visitors, Gandhiji pointed out that it was already too late for the Chinese as a nation to organize Non-violence and to resist the evil Japan is pouring into China. The army of peace cannot be built in a day and its soldiers cannot learn the sublime art of resisting evil in as short a time as they can learn the ugly art of handling a gun. In China it is left only to individuals to practise Non-violence; and if a sufficient number of the Celestial Kingdom begin at once to study and to practise the truly celestial science of *Satyāgraha,* when the time comes, and it may come any day, they will be able to save the Soul of China. Gandhiji explained that "a nation's culture resides in the hearts and in the soul of its people. ... Japan cannot force drugs down unwilling throats at the point of the bayonet."

He told his visitor to say to his people this: "The Japanese cannot corrupt our Soul. If the Soul of China is injured, it will not be by Japan." This is true of every nation; but there are nations, e.g., Britain, which can put their own affairs in order by building up quickly the Army of Peace and can thus become instrumental in saving other peoples. If Britain's

armament-building programme sets other people following her, why could not her organized efforts at the practice of *Satyāgraha* also energize others to do the same? Let her organize to walk "the way of peace that comes from a simple and godly life."

EDITOR

The One Who Never Spoke Amiss

When to the being of humblest birth
My Lord hope and joy conveyed
A happy tremor shook Mother Earth
And Mara shrank dismayed.

Aglow remains the flame of Dharma,
We only heedful must abide,
And comprehend that Law of Karma
No one can change or override.

To emphasize that life is sorrow,
To cut asunder human greed,
To tell that sweet will be tomorrow
If we deserve for service meed,

That our goal must be consistent,
That pride must melt like sparkling snow,
That our work must be persistent:
Such is in gist the Buddha's Law.

It is the gospel of the Great Healer
That the deepest thing in us is bliss.
He was not only the Great Revealer
But One who never spoke amiss.

FRIEDRICH V. LUSTIG

NEVILLE BRAYBROOKE

Voices in the Desert

A Dialogue between C. G. Jung and Teilhard de Chardin

[Our old friend Mr. Neville Braybrooke writes, "Jung and Teilhard studied man's past in order to understand his present course. Their writings and conversation reveal the worship of God which they found." He has constructed this imaginary dialogue based on their writings and letters, and revealed how the thought of these two pre-eminent thinkers of the twentieth century dovetails. They approach from different sides the truth of the Divine presence which is to be sought and found within man and in life on earth.—ED.]

TEILHARD: Has not the moment passed when God speaks in the desert?

NARRATOR: Pierre Teilhard de Chardin first asked the question in 1923. He was an ordained Jesuit priest of twelve years' standing, and he was making his first journey to the Far East. All day his ship had been gliding through the Gulf of Suez, between the sharp, bare peaks of the Egyptian mountains, and the slashed red sandstone and granite of Sinai.

TEILHARD: How I would love to have scrambled ashore and tested those rocky slopes! But not only with my geologist's hammer. I would love to have learned if I too could hear the voice of the Burning Bush. Has not perhaps the moment passed when God speaks in the desert?

NARRATOR: Carl Gustav Jung was born in 1875, six years before Teilhard, and outlived him by another six. In his work he takes up the same cry.

JUNG: I am concerned with the inner voice that a man can hear anywhere. Not only in the desert, but in a city or on board ship. In each of us there is imprinted an image of God, or rather "God-image." That term "God-image" is one I am particularly fond of. I have borrowed it from the early Church Fathers.

NARRATOR: Jung was a qualified doctor and psychiatrist. At the turn of the century he began his researches at Burghëlzli Central Hospital in Zurich.

JUNG: That is so. I am a practising psychiatrist. I am eighty and I continue to see patients. As a physician I have been privileged to see deeply into the lives of many people and am well aware that a patient's religious attitude plays a crucial part in the therapy of psychic illness. But what ages it has taken the Churches to pay any attention! I like to think of myself as a doctor of the soul.

NARRATOR: Jung never met Teilhard. But he had read with enthusiasm many of Teilhard's scientific papers on rock and fossils and Early Man

— subjects that had always fascinated him — and Teilhard in turn was well acquainted with and sympathetic to many of Jung's ideas.

TEILHARD: I am very interested in his theories, in particular in his belief in archetypes and the whole Jungian concept of the collective subconscious.

NARRATOR: But like some of Teilhard's own ideas, the collective subconscious has often proved a stumbling-block. Over-zealous disciples have made his writings about it, no less than Teilhard's about the phenomenon of man, appear far more difficult than they are. In their commentaries they have muddied the spring — and often the spring, if returned to, is strikingly clear. Both priest and psychiatrist were explorers, explorers of the *within* and the *without* of man, and the links between the two. Their explorations began on immense and simple lines, and for both there was one decisive question to which everything led up.

JUNG: Is man related to something infinite or not?

TEILHARD: Return to the Father, resonance to the All — can everything be summed up in that?

NARRATOR: This is a universal question and so their thought has crossed every frontier — racial, political, and spiritual. Because, when a question or problem has once been formulated, a long way has been travelled towards solving it. Both Teilhard and Jung formulated theirs early — though as schoolboys both felt suffocated by institutional religion. Teilhard was indeed a very clever boy — top in every subject except religious instruction.

TEILHARD: They told us that God blessed Jesus. But how could he if Jesus was already part of the godhead? And those goody-goody romances about the saints and the martyrs! Whatever normal child would want to spend an eternity in such boring company? *Quelle fantaisie!*

NARRATOR: Jung too was a clever boy, in fact so clever that he was sometimes accused by his teachers of copying his essays out of books.

JUNG: Divinity classes were unspeakably dull. I wanted to know what sort of person God really was; so I slipped off to my father's library to try and discover. My father was a country parson — liberal, tolerant, and understanding — but, theologically, he was antediluvian. His notion of God belonged to the later part of the Middle Ages, like most people's in Switzerland then. I am referring to the seventies of the last century. But in the library I hit upon A. E. Bierdermann, one of whose books had a chapter on the nature of God. I was sixteen at the time. Here, apparently, was a man who thought for himself, who worked out his own views. At least that was my first impression. Yet as I read on I became disappointed. Bierdermann wrote about God's satisfaction with the world on

the Seventh Day, but then went on to state that God had taken good care that the glory of Paradise should not last too long. For this reason he had planted Satan in it. I asked myself, had God taken satisfaction in that too? I felt certain Bierdermann did not mean this, but was simply babbling on in the mindless way that characterized religious instruction, not even aware that he was writing nonsense.

NARRATOR: So it was that from an early age both Jung and Teilhard knew that they were on their own. The cost of that independence of mind, of that vision which you can detect even in their earliest work, was to be isolation.

TEILHARD: Will anyone ever listen to me?

NARRATOR: That sigh comes in one of Teilhard's letters written to his cousin Marguerite in 1919. It was to recur many times more in the years that followed.

JUNG: I am an outsider. Loneliness does not come from having no people about you, but from being unable to communicate the things that seem important to oneself to others.

NARRATOR: Both Jung and Teilhard were twentieth-century voices in the desert. They had to learn to possess their souls in patience. They had to believe that their explorations, and what they found on them, were their own reward. They had to accept their mission as patient prophets. No wonder that the Old Testament figure of Job held such a fascination for both.

TEILHARD: Sometimes setbacks and checks, even human setbacks, will divert our activity on to objects, admittedly human objects, which are more propitious. That is what happened to Job, whose final happiness was greater than his first.

NARRATOR: These checks are sometimes called Fate, or Providence. Teilhard and Jung refer to them as the inner voice, the voice which hermits went out into the desert and wilderness to hear.

JUNG: The Book of Job serves as an example for a certain experience of God which has a special significance for us today. For these experiences come upon a man from inside as well as from outside.

NARRATOR: That passage comes from the introduction to Jung's study of Job, which he published at the age of 77. The same study ends:

JUNG: No man is ever more than his own limited ego before the One who dwells in him, whose form has no knowable boundaries, who encompasses him on all sides, fathomless as the abysms of the earth and vast as the sky.

TEILHARD: We must understand today that God no more speaks exclusively in the desert. Nor can his voice only be heard in inaccessible

mountains. On the contrary, "He Who Is" dwells everywhere. It is only a matter of learning to look into the profound sphere of things, *of every thing*. The secret of the world lies wherever we can discern the transparency of the universe. We could say in fact that the great mystery of Christianity lies not in the appearance of God in the universe but in his transparence in it.

NARRATOR: So, no longer is there any need then for men to go out into the wilderness. There are deserts in the mind where the inner voice can speak, just as God's presence is to be discerned all around. Jung and Teilhard have taught us to *see* with new eyes, and to *listen* with new ears.

TEILHARD: *Seeing*. To see things as they are and to see them really and intensely. You might say that the whole point of life lies in that. We live in a cosmos in which there is always something more to be discovered and to see — not only physically or scientifically but spiritually as well.

JUNG: I have treated a great many elderly people and have noticed that when one of them ceases to look forward to the next day as if he had centuries to spend, but looks back, then he petrifies, gets stiff, and dies before his time. Of course it is quite obvious that we are all going to die. Yet the truth is that, though we accept this rationally, there is also something in us that does not quite believe it.

NARRATOR: Teilhard had noticed something similar about Job.

TEILHARD: You will remember that when hail, fire, and thieves had taken everything from Job — all his wealth, all his family — Satan could say to God: "Skin for skin, and all that a man hath he will give for his life. But put forth thy hand and then thou shalt see he will curse thee to thy face." In a sense the loss of things means little to us because we can always imagine getting them back. At rock bottom perhaps none of us are fatalists.

NARRATOR: Perhaps this reading of Job corroborates Jung's view of the psyche within us, that voice within which will not quite let us accept either the fact of our own oncoming death, or the fact ...

JUNG: ... that death is the sad finale of everything. Let me explain. Let me explain why I have repeatedly held that psychologically death is just as important as birth, and, like it, an integral part of life. The psyche within each of us is not confined by the ordinary laws of space and time. You must have noticed this when you dream. Often you can see round corners and such things, and see into the future too. These are facts that have always existed — and only blind ignorance would deny them. Moreover these facts show that the psyche cannot be confined. It means that there must be a practical continuation of life, a sort of psychical existence beyond time and space. That is why I have never been sympathetic to

the idea of boxing life into compartments. That is why I have no use for those who refer to things as having *only* a scientific meaning, *only* a religious relevance, *only* a medical bearing. I do not like "only" judgements. As I grow older I find the dividing wall between things more and more transparent. Reality embraces everything, and I know from my experience as a doctor that medicine has not made its advances through the discovery of some trick of healing. Quite the opposite. It has evolved into a science of enormous complexity — not the least of reasons being that it has made borrowings from all possible fields.

TEILHARD: When I try to analyse myself, it seems to me that my own individual hopes in an after-life in no way prevent me from devoting myself to the world. I see nothing incompatible between my callings to be a priest and a scientist. The disciplines of both help me to develop. What I oppose is any kind of rigorism, of trying to squeeze people into moulds, of trying to force their consciences. I have been reading recently a book by the Trappist Abbot of Sept-Fons. There are some good things in it — though some I disagree with. It is all very well to talk about running a youth club with only supernatural resources, but we should not forget the other aspects of education — cooking, P.T., amateur theatricals. All these aspects of education, a full education, make us fitter to know and to serve God. There should not be abrupt divisions or dividing-walls. Christianity, rightly understood, should inform the whole man. These thoughts have come to me sitting in a trench during the lull in the bombardment. I have been using my pack to write on.

NARRATOR: After the 1914–18 War, Teilhard often spoke to student groups in Paris. On one occasion in 1924, he chose as his subject André Gide the novelist. Gide's books had been receiving a battering from many of Teilhard's co-religionists, in particular his *Fruits of the Earth.*

TEILHARD: My object, my friends, is to show that Christian spirituality may gain from Gide's eulogy on the world of the flesh. No, I am not trying to make a Catholic of him. But through Gide, and despite Gide, I have found in his novels, and in this book especially, springs of clear water from which any Christian may drink with benefit.

NARRATOR: That was always Teilhard's approach.

TEILHARD: I want to show that God today, more than ever, does invade our universe — whatever the pagans say. He penetrates it as a ray of light does a crystal. Everything is sanctified, every layer of creation from the biosphere of flora and fauna which covers the face of the universe, to what I have called the Noosphere. That is a word I have coined — at least I think I did. Maybe my very dear friend Edouard Le Roy first used it in one of our conversations in the mid-twenties. You can never

be sure who starts ideas. Anyway, by Noosphere I mean a layer of thought which you and I by our conscious thinking spread over the universe. You might say that the earth gets a new skin. Better still, it finds a soul.

NARRATOR: These are controversial words. They challenged the old conceptions — and many churchmen ran for cover. But to others they represented a break-through, they answered a spiritual need of the time. Here was a man preparing the way for the Lord, but preparing it in an essentially twentieth-century way. Nor was his challenge limited to scientific exploration. It went also into his books about the interior life. And indeed so much were his ideas all of a piece that throughout all his writings resounded the same affirmation.

TEILHARD: Adoration is research; research is adoration. Sometimes when I have said this, I have been told, "That may be so for the priest or scientist, but what about the ordinary man who works in an office or in a factory? How can a fitter's life in a modern factory workshop be adoration? Surely at the best, at the most, his spiritual life can be no more than a hasty morning offering, some prayers at night, and a keeping of the Sabbath?" Once in China a business friend of mine asked me, "How can a commercial enterprise bring with it moral progress?" I replied, "Because your undertaking is going well, a little more health is being spread in the human mass, and in consequence a little more liberty to act, to think, to love."

NARRATOR: That use of the word "to love" needs emphasis. Teilhard is not using it in a romantic sense. Instead he is using it in a cosmic sense, in a way that finds an immediate response to Jung's view.

JUNG: "Love bears all things," "Love endures all things." In the profoundest sense we are all victims of cosmogenic love. Whether it speaks with "the tongues of angels," or with scientific exactitude it traces the life of the cell down to its uttermost source, "Love ceases not." It gives meaning to our whole life.

TEILHARD: I always like to stress "wholeness." My concern is with the whole phenomenon of man, with the "wholeness" of life and with its direction.

JUNG: What a man cannot endure is to be aimless, without direction. To find life meaningless is to suffer from an illness. Neurotics in cities are often people who know nothing about nature, who are so isolated in their apartments that they know nothing about life in the countryside. They are quite unadapted to reality. They are like children, and it is necessary to tell them the facts of life, so to speak.

TEILHARD: The universe holds together. It is all of a piece — a garment without a seam.

JUNG: If you follow the story of evolution, you will find that man completes creation.

TEILHARD: If you look at man's place in the world, you will find that he is irreplaceable. That is why man's life cannot be cut into sections. That is why once you can accept the fact that research is adoration, then the whole of man's life — if properly understood — becomes worship. Science, far from challenging Christianity, complements it, because both the path of religion and the path of science lead upwards, and everything that rises must converge. This is happening all the time, all around us. There is no such thing as a Sunday Christianity. Christianity is for Sunday and for every day.

JUNG: In a book of mine about the collective subconscious, I have shown the dangers of a Sunday religion. A theologian had come to see me because he had been troubled by the repetition of a certain dream. In it, he would find himself standing and looking at a low valley covered with dense wood. In the dream he knew that in the middle of the woods there was a lake, and he knew that hitherto something had always prevented him from going there. Then one night in the dream he determined to reach the lake. As he approached it, the atmosphere grew uncanny, and suddenly a light gust of wind passed over the surface of the water, which rippled darkly. He awoke with a cry of terror. It fell to me to remind him of the Pool of Bethseda in which the sick were bathed. I had to recall for him how in the New Testament an angel descended and touched the waters and how they thereby acquired a curative power. My theologian wanted nothing of this. All very well, he remonstrated, to speak of the Holy Ghost in a sermon, but not as a phenomenon to be experienced. All very well to read of such things in the Bible, but they had nothing to do with you or I in our everyday life.

NARRATOR: For Jung, the spontaneous images produced by our psyche of pools and deserts were a constant reminder of the religious content in our nature — examples of the Holy Ghost speaking within; while, for Teilhard, the Pool at Bethseda was an example of God immersing himself in the mystery of creation, a reminder that all the time Christ is uniting himself with the forces of earth. And so closely-knit were the ideas of these two men of our century that their writings offer us a dialogue of two minds, though there is one place where it becomes monologue. That is because Jung never confided his prayers to us in print, whereas Teilhard, being a priest, was often in the habit of sharing his.

TEILHARD: O, God, creator of heaven and earth, teach us not to forget the earth, because in earth I find hope, enrichment, and virility. I surrender myself to its mighty layers, with faith in the heavenly influence

which has sweetened and purified its waters. The virtues of Christ have passed into it, even unto the wildest and most unknown regions, like wildernesses and deserts. Let the attractions of the earth lead me forward, let its sap be the food which nourishes me, let its resistance give me toughness, let its power strengthen me. And, finally, let its whole being lead me towards the godhead for ever and ever. Amen.

NARRATOR: So it was that for Teilhard and Jung there was no division between their lives and worship.

TEILHARD: Our world is extending its dimensions all the time. Men are discovering more and more about every sphere in it. So must our conception of God in the universe be extended, so must our range of universal prayer.

JUNG: Try to see and hear the voice of inner being, what I call the "God-image" of the psyche within us. Become conscious of the contents that press upwards from the unconscious. Be ready to listen to what they have to tell. Remember the patience of Job.

TEILHARD: Remember Job. Trust always in the slow work of God.

JUNG: My thoughts circle round God like planets round the sun. All life desires eternity.

TEILHARD: I cannot define the world otherwise than by a gradual awakening of the consciousness. Research is precisely the frontier in the spreading of this universal consciousness. Research finds out all things, because research is adoration, research is love.

JUNG: Love "bears all things," love "endures all things." These words say all there is to be said.

NEVILLE BRAYBROOKE

WHAT drives people to war with themselves is the intuition or the knowledge that they consist of two persons in opposition to one another. The conflict may be between the sensual and the spiritual man. ... It is what Faust means when he says: "Two souls, alas, dwell in my breast apart." A neurosis is a dissociation of personality.

Healing may be called a religious problem. In the sphere of social or national relations, the state of suffering may be civil war, and this state is to be cured by the Christian virtue of forgiveness for those who hate us. That which we try with the conviction of good Christians to apply to external situations, we must also apply to the inner state in the treatment of neurosis. This is why modern man has heard enough about guilt and sin. He is sorely enough beset by his own bad conscience, and wants rather to learn how he is to reconcile himself with his own nature — how he is to love the enemy in his own heart ...

C. G. JUNG

P. NAGARAJA RAO

The Middle Way (*Madhyama Marga*)

[Our old friend Dr. P. Nagaraja Rao, M.A., D.LITT., until recently a professor of philosophy at Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupathi, traces in this article the concept of a golden mean or a middle way in more than one philosophical tradition. Self-indulgence and world-negation are equally errors that disturb the right relation of the inhabitants of this universe. This is one of the senses in which the path of the spirit is as a razor's edge.—ED.]

It is not the life of knowledge, not even if it included all the sciences, that creates happiness and well-being, but *a single branch* of knowledge —*the science of good and evil.* If you exclude this from other branches, medicine will be equally able to give us health, and shoemaking shoes, and weaving clothes. Seamanship will still save life at sea and strategy win battles. But without the knowledge of good and evil the use and the excellence of these sciences will be found to have failed us.

—PLATO: *Charmides,* 176

If one can live in perfect accord with the principle of *Dharma* in the hearts of men, there is no need for such a one to go to holy Ganges or Kurukṣetra (for pilgrimage).

—MANU

Pride of knowledge, pride of wealth and thirdly the pride of respectable pedigree are intoxications for the haughty; these three are verily deterrents for the virtuous.

—*Viduranīti,* v. 45

IN THE HISTORY of human ethical thought several theories of good conduct are adumbrated and different ways of life described. All of them range between two extremes, Renunciation (*nivṛtti*) and the active social life, respecting the obligations of one's station and duty (*pravṛtti*). The man who lived such an active life in society, worked for his good and was ensuring his individual well-being here and hereafter. The path of renunciation produces indifference and an attitude of non-concern for society and our fellow men. It depletes the present life of all values and significance. You tend to regard life on earth as a snare, and the earth as a place to quit as soon as possible. Ethical life is not invested with any earnestness or incentive. Life is just a bridge, a middle term, over which to pass on to Eternity. The negators quote the *Gītā,* "Having entered this impermanent sorrowful world, do then worship me" (IX.33). Jesus echoes the same sentiment. "The world is a bridge; pass over it but do not build upon it."

Between these two ideals the great scriptures of the world and sages and seers have discovered and disclosed and glorified an ethical ideal familiarly described as the Golden Mean. It is as old as the *Gītā,* Plato, Aristotle, Confucius, etc. It is the ethic of the wise, cultured and contented men of the world, within the reach of us all — common men. The Golden Mean of Aristotle takes the same Middle Path as described by the Buddha, the path which avoids the two extremes of asceticism and unbounded indulgence. The *Gītā* gives not only an outline of the path but also fills it in with all the details. In short, the *yoga* of the *Gītā* is this path, meant for all. Lord Kṛṣṇa declares that

> *yoga* is not for him who eats too much or abstains too much. It is not for him who sleeps too much or keeps awake too long. For the man who is temperate in food and recreation, who is restrained in action, whose sleep and waking are well regulated, there ensues *yoga* which destroys all sorrow (VI. 16-17).

The *yoga* of the *Gītā* fuses the two extremes (renunciation and indulgence) and strikes the Golden Mean as the path to tread. It frees *pravṛtti-mārga* of all selfishness by insisting on devotion to the Lord and duty to society, and it corrects the one-sidedness of the path of *saṁnyāsa* by freeing it from inactivity and making renunciation not formal but motivational. Some may hold the view that the middle path was not initiated by the *Gītā,* but none can deny the fact that the *Gītā* in a splendid setting has given a wide, explicit, and permanent currency to this view. The *yoga* of the *Gītā* is further recommended for its liberating power. "Know this *yoga,*" says the Lord, "to be the divorce from the union with pain and sorrow (*duḥkha-saṁyoga-viyogam*) (VI.23).

This Middle Path is described in glowing terms by Milton in *Areopagitica*:

> Wherefore [he asks] did He [God] create passions within us, pleasures round and about us, but that these, rightly tempered, are the very ingredients of virtue? ... Suppose we could expel sin by this means; look how much we thus expel of sin, so much we expel of virtue: for the matter of them both is the same; remove that, ye remove them both alike.

The venerable Plato in his *Laws* writes:

> If any one gives too great powers to anything, too large a sail to a vessel, too much food for the body, too much in the wantonness of excess, runs in the one case to disorder and in the other to injustice which is the child of excess.

The Golden Mean is not a mere prudential outlook on life based on a "safety first" principle or love of mere compromise. It is not the result of

cold calculation and the mere careful adjustment to effect sheer survival. It is based on a sound metaphysics and is the result of mature thinking. It is born of the attitude of "reverence for life," to use the celebrated phrase of Schweitzer. Long before Aristotle Greek tradition in its earliest thinkers has given us the dim outlines of this doctrine. Heracleitus has a striking saying in his description and formula for substance: "It is the adjustment of opposed tensions as of the bow and the lyre." A famous sculptor, Polycleitus, in the only surviving sentence of his canon is reported to have said: "That which is well comes into being little by little by means of many numbers."[1]

The doctrine as an ethical code insists on a positive view of life. It exhibits virtue as a "positive achievement." It makes morality concrete. Further, the constant dualisms between Nature and Man, Matter and Form, Freedom and Fate are resolved into a unity by the introduction of the principle of proportion, ratio, and order. Plato in his *Timaeus* regards creation itself as the result of order: "Before that time all things were without ratio or measure. But when the creator set himself to order the whole, he first differentiated this confusion by means of shape and numbers."[2] The psychologist who terrorizes us with his findings is silenced by this doctrine. Here no repression is advocated, which leads to remorses and surprising outlets, nor is over-indulgence permitted which wrecks one's personality. Careful cultivation and calculated satisfaction of desires is upheld. In the words of Huxley, no God must be cheated, none overpaid. All must be given their due. Moderation is not mere calculation, but is the principle of integration. It is not merely worldly wisdom as given by Lord Chesterfield to his son. It can be used for moral development. Chesterfield writes to his son:

> The sure characteristic of a strong and sound mind is to find everything within those certain bounds. These boundaries are marked out by a very fine line which only good sense and attention can discover, it is too much for vulgar eyes. In manners this line is good breeding, beyond it is troublesome ceremony, short of it is unbecoming negligence and inattention. In morals it divides ostentatious puritanism from criminal relaxation; in religion superstition from impiety and in short every virtue from its kindred vice and weakness.

The practice of this doctrine gives us balance. It makes men not the victims of passions but agents able to withstand the sway of impulse, the pressure of temptation, the swarmings of emotions. It enables one to banish hurry and to weigh the pros and cons of a course of conduct.

---

[1] See J. L. STOCKS: *The Limits of Purpose* (1932), p. 250.

[2] PLATO: *Timaeus* 53 a, b.

It enables one to see this not through the mist of passion but through the clear light of Reason. The principle of moderation is not merely balancing of two extremes. It is the integrating principle of *Dharma*. The concept of *Dharma* indicates the Middle Path. It governs and sustains the *equipoise*. It is the regulating value that governs the proper use of instrumental values like those of (*Artha*) possessions and (*Kāma*) passions. *Dharma* is so called because it holds up the just social order. The Middle Path is the *Dharma Mārga,* The Law of *Dharma*. It is the Lotus of Right life (*Sad-dharma Puṇḍarīka*) in Buddhist parlance. The Lord, in the *Gītā,* opines that he is "the *Kāma,* desires, not contrary to *Dharma* in men (VII.2). The Middle Way is the path of *Dharma*. Our national poet Valmīki has delineated the character of Ramachandra to illustrate the Middle Path walked by Rāma in the face of formidable opposing forces. One has to read the epic, to see the behaviour and hear the words of wisdom of Ramachandra to understand the path of *Dharma*![3] It is also commended on pragmatic grounds by both the epics of India. "*Dharma* protects him who observes it and he who upsets it is destroyed."[4] An examination of this doctrine and its metaphysical foundations discloses that it is not merely a counsel of caution, timidity, and compromise. The doctrine cuts across the opposition between Man and Nature. It invests life with a significance as the place where we learn the art of soul-making. The doctrine is common sense and pure philosophy rolled into one.

P. NAGARAJA RAO

IN governing men and in serving Heaven, there is nothing like moderation. For only by moderation can there be an early return to man's normal state. This early return is the same as a great storage of Virtue. With a great storage of Virtue there is naught which may not be achieved. If there is naught which may not be achieved, then no one will know to what extent this power reaches. And if no one knows to what extent a man's power reaches, that man is fit to be the ruler of a State. Having the secret of rule, his rule shall endure. Setting the tap-root deep, and making the spreading roots firm: this is the way to ensure long life to the tree.

LAO TZU: *Tao Te King*

---

[3] See *Rāmāyaṇa*, the debate between Bharata and Rāma, when the former tries to persuade Rāma to break his promise and return to the throne of Ayodhyā.

[4] *Dharma eva hato hanti Dharmo rakṣati rakṣitaḥ.*

SUJITKUMAR MUKHOPADHYAYA

The Quintessence of the *Shunyata* Doctrine

[Shri Sujitkumar Mukhopadhyaya is Reader in the Department of Indo-Tibetan Studies of the Visva-Bharati University. In this brief piece he has collated authoritative expositions of the insight represented by the *Śūnyatā* doctrine — and the doctrine is a spiritual essence to be breathed in, rather than a philosophical formulation.—ED.]

"I CANNOT bear the burden of the sky above my head; I feel suffocated. O save me!" a terrified man was shouting.

You are astonished to hear this. I am astonished as well, when I find you thus astonished on hearing my doctrine of *Śūnyatā* (lit., Voidness).

Come out of the house and stand under the sky. Breathe in the open air. As far as your eyesight goes, there is no shed, no shelter, no trace of trees, only open fields stretched up to the horizon.

On the right and the left, in front and behind, is the same expanse of virgin soil. Overhead, the firmament — the limitless sky.

Rest for some time in such peaceful surroundings. You will feel refreshed. You will be inspired with new life.

To keep the body in good health, we go out for a walk. We roam about in the open air.

In a similar way, to keep the mind in good health, go out of the self and roam about in *Śūnyatā.*

Make the mind free from all assumptions, from all imaginations or ideas, good or bad. Liberate it from all views; from attachment and detachment, from love and hatred, from joy and grief. Wash it, clean it, and purify it.[1]

You purge your body for the good of your health. I purge the mind for its good.

The best purgative is that which purges completely. *Śūnyatā* is the best purgative for the mind.[2]

You bathe to wash your body and cool it. I plunge deep in *Śūnyatā* to wash the mind and to make it calm and tranquil.

Don't dwell on ideas such as existence, non-existence; voidness, non-voidness; permanence, impermanence; unity, duality; plurality, non-plurality; soul, non-soul.

---

[1] "The aim of *Śūnyatā* is to make the mind free from all views (all 'isms'), but those who accept *Śūnyatā* as a view and cling to it are incurable indeed—thus said the Conquering Ones (the Buddhas)." *Mūlamādhyamaka,* XIII. 8; *Catuḥśataka,* XVI; *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā,* IX; p 414

[2] "*Śūnyatā* is like a strong purgative; if, after clearing the bowels, the purgative does not come out but remains inside, it does harm."—*Mūlamādhyamaka,* XIII. 8; *Catuḥśataka,* XVI

Drive these out of your mind. Keep it absolutely free from all such notions. Leave the mind in its original state of pure, tranquil, illuminative brightness.

Śūnyatā literally means voidness or non-entity, but it is not voidness or non-entity.[3] It does not lead one to ruin.

What then does it lead to?

That cannot be expressed in words. Words are but the expression of our ideas; how can that be expressed in words which is beyond all ideas?[4]

How can an ordinary thermometer measure the heat of the sun?[5]

Therefore, I have to answer this question by observing silence. All the Sages of ancient times have done so.

Bāskali asked Bāhva questions on the *Brahman*. Bāhva answered them by keeping silent.[6]

Vimalakīrti did the same when Mañjuśrī asked him questions on the Reality.[7]

Wash the Seat in your heart. Cleanse it of all filth. Make it stainless and keep it vacant. Then wait with patience. The One that deserves it will come and seat Himself there.

Like the magnet that attracts steel, purity attracts Purity. Purify yourself, then the Fountain of Purity will flow over you.

The Brāhmaṇa Vasiṣṭha, accompanied by his friends, came to the Buddha to ask questions on Brahmā.

The Buddha asked:

"Does Brahmā accept gifts from anybody?"

"No, Gautama."

"Has He ill-feeling for anybody?"

"No, Gautama."

"How is He? Is He pure in heart?"

"Yes, indeed!"

"Is He dependent or independent?"

"Independent."

---

[3] "The meaning of the word *Śūnyatā* does not correspond to the meaning of the word *abhāva* (non-entity). Having assumed the sense of the word non-entity (*abhāva*) to be the same as that of *Śūnyatā*, you accuse us in vain."—*Mūlamādhyamaka*, XXIV. 7

"For the cessation of entire Phenomenon, *Śūnyatā* is taught. So the aim of *Śūnyatā* is the cessation of Phenomena. Where is negation (*nāstitva*) in *Śūnyatā*? So (it is clear) you do not know or understand *Śūnyatā*."—*Ibid.*

[4] *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā*, IX; pp. 363, 366–7

[5] S. RADHAKRISHNAN

[6] *Vedāntadarśana (Śāṅkara-bhāṣya)*, III. 2, 17

[7] *Eastern Buddhist*, Vol. IV (1927), pp. 177–83

Mañjuśri enquired about Non-duality (the Reality), and it was described by different disciples of the Buddha in different ways. But when Vimalakirti was asked about it, he remained silent. Mañjuśri exclaimed: "Well done, Vimalakirti! It is you who have realised it."

"Do the Brāhmaṇas accept gifts?"
"Yes, Gautama."
"Are they free from ill-will?"
"No, Gautama."
"Are they pure in heart?"
"No, Gautama."
"Are they independent?"
"No, Gautama."
"Is it possible for the Brāhmaṇas who accept gifts, who have ill-feelings, who are not purified and who are not independent, to be in union with Brahmā, Who is just the opposite?"
"No, Gautama."
The Buddha then asked Vasiṣṭha:
"Do the Bhikṣus accept gifts?"
"No, Gautama."
"Have they ill-feelings?"
"No, Gautama."
"Are they purified?"
"Yes, Gautama."
"Are they independent?"
"Yes, Gautama."
"Is it possible for the greedless Bhikṣus who are free from ill-will, who are pure in heart, who are independent, to be in union with Brahmā, Who is of the same nature?"
"Yes, Gautama."[8]

Get rid of lust, ill-will, infatuation — the impurities, this is the teaching of the Buddha.

Therefore, it is our duty to purify the heart and keep the Seat inside vacant.

If you fill you Cup with refuse, where will you hold the Nectar when it flows down to you?[9]

SUJITKUMAR MUKHOPADHYAYA

---

[8] *Tevijja-sutta, Dīgha-nikāya*, Vol. 1

[9] "To get rid of all views, *Śūnyatā* is taught; this is indeed the Nectar of Deathlessness." —*Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā*, pp. 359, 415

ARTHUR L. HERMAN

The Nature of Aesthetic Judgement

[Readers will remember Dr. Arthur L. Herman of the Department of Philosophy of the Wisconsin State University, U.S.A., for his many interesting contributions to our pages. We commence with this issue a long article which will appear in three instalments. The first one which appears below opens the discussion by leading up pleasantly to a formulation of the objective and the subjective criteria of beauty.—ED.]

I : Objective and Subjective Criteria of Beauty

RECENTLY I was asked to be a judge in an art show in a rather large city in the United States. Invitations of this sort are usually turned down because I am red-green colour-blind. While I have the greatest confidence driving a car or explaining Impressionism to a class of sophomores, I am quite uneasy judging paintings by mature artists. But this time I accepted the invitation and discovered that my handicap really did not make so much difference after all. The works I judged as beautiful or worthy of first, second, or third prize, my fellow judges (there were three of us) also regarded as beautiful and worthy of first, second, or third prize.

However, there was one painting whose merits none of us could agree upon. I stood somewhere in the centre of the discussion, happily seeing the virtues of both arguments by my colleagues as they came out in the course of the discussion. I have tried here to represent the exchange as I understood it rather than as I heard it. It went somewhat as follows:

MR. A: No, I don't see it. I frankly don't see it.

MR. B: It's the lines. The way they cross over here and also the way the same pattern is repeated on this side. Further, the colours are sonorous and yet whispery. See the way these reds and blues intermingle, so delicately ... this sounding rhythm with these lines gives tone and body to the entire composition.

MR. A (who is a philosopher of art): So what?

MR. B: I beg your pardon?

MR. A: I say "so what?" So you've got patterned lines, sonorous and symphonic colours, and a delicate blending of line and colour which give tone and body to the work. I still say "so what?" ... No, forgive me. I'm not being offensive [for you must understand the other judge was an artist and quite sensitive about the brusque and probing attitude of the philosopher.] I am merely saying that what you see in the painting is precisely what I see there, though I might describe it in a less emotional way. That is to say, you and I can both see the arrangement of these lines, here, and describe these colours, here, in language agreeable to both of

us and yet disagree that the combining of these colours and these lines into these particular forms is a worth-while undertaking.

MR. B: Perhaps you, sir, are aesthetically insensitive?

MR. A: And yet we both agreed that the other works we looked at earlier were worthy of first, second, or third prize, that is, beautiful, did we not?

MR. B: Perhaps if we were to go over those decisions again we might discover that we both had different reasons for calling them "worthy of first prize," "worthy of second prize," and so forth. You still haven't shown me, sir, that in the matter of this work here, you are not just an insensitive clod.

(At this point the exchange is not worth quoting as it has very little to do with the subject I am leading up to. After Mr. B. had defined "insensitive clod" to the satisfaction of Mr. A, the latter reopened the discussion.)

MR. A: If we were to review those other paintings to which we gave prizes, I think we might discover that again we would both agree on what we saw in the painting and that we would, at least in those other works, also agree that they were prize-worthy. I am curious as to why that is not the case with this painting.

(At this point they did, indeed, look over two of the other paintings which had taken first and second prize and they did agree on what they saw in the paintings and they did agree that what they saw made the paintings "prize-worthy," to use Mr. A's terminology. Then they returned to the first painting and continued their discussion.)

MR. B: Would you agree that the arrangement of form and colour you have just seen in those paintings made them beautiful?

MR. A: I would say that the criteria upon which I judged them were the ones you mentioned and it was upon this judgement that I gave them prizes.

MR. B: Can't you see that this painting here also has the same relationships of form and colour as those other paintings?

MR. A: They are not identical, certainly.

MR. B: Of course not! but they do have the same approximate formal properties.

(At this point, as the voices were growing louder, a definition was asked for and "formal properties" was labelled appropriately. Both of my fellow judges agreed that there were formal and objective properties in the painting, both agreed on the nature of these properties, and both agreed that these properties had been in the other works judged prize-worthy by us; but Mr. A. would not agree that these properties made this particular painting prize-worthy. Mr. A. closed the argument as follows:)

MR. A: Certainly you would not agree that if I sat down and coldly, carefully, and methodically constructed a painting using all the formal properties that made these other works here prize-worthy — certainly you would not judge such a technically put-together work prize-worthy.

MR. B: I see nothing wrong with that. If these properties are present the painting is beautiful and that's an end to it.

MR. A: Then what about creative genius? What about artistic emotion and aesthetic inspiration?

(I was surprised to hear a philosopher like Mr. A talk this way and use this sort of language, but then I thought that perhaps he was baiting Mr. B. This seemed to be the case; for Mr. B. was perturbed and seemed to retreat from his objective position.)

MR. B: Well ... naturally enough, you can't destroy creative genius.

MR. A: And individuality, my dear sir.

MR. B: No, of course not, nor individuality. These, naturally ... of course ... are part of every ... that is all real works of art. They must stay ... what would become of beauty? You cannot destroy this spark ... this flame. ... There's more to art than technical cunning.

The two judges seemed to agree that there is more to prize-worthy or beautiful art objects than merely formal properties and objective criteria, and yet neither had a way of discovering this other "more." Naturally I was interested in this question once it had been raised, and, since there were so many appreciators of art there at the exhibit — I mean "real" appreciators, people who were not red-green colour-blind, for instance — I made a point of contacting one of them. The person I chose was a woman possibly in her fifties who carried a notebook with her on which she wrote after looking at the paintings. The reason I chose her as an appreciator of art, however, was neither her age nor her tablet but the fact that she seemed to linger over each painting and savour it: stepping back while tilting her head from side to side, then walking slowly forward, stopping, staring for long minutes at the whole work and then blocking out portions of it with her hand before her eyes, all the while making little clucking sounds with her tongue, until, finally, standing still for perhaps three minutes staring at it, she moved on to the next painting writing in her notebook as she walked.

I: Pardon me, I wonder if I could bother you for a moment?

(I caught her between pictures)

SHE: Certainly. You're one of the judges? Mr. ... ?

(I introduced myself and she herself.)

I: I'd like to ask you a question, and it's this: How do you judge whether a picture is beautiful or not?

SHE: That's a strange question for a judge to put to me. Aren't you supposed to know?

I: Yes, of course, but I was curious about what you were doing. You are making some kind of judgement about the picture, and evidently you write it down, there, in your book.

SHE: Yes, I do make judgements. And they are concerned with the beauty of these paintings.

I: May I ask how you do it?

SHE: Certainly. I suppose everyone has his own little approach to the painting. I like to have it knock me about a bit before I judge it. I get the right perspective by backing away from it like this. My eye receives all the angles of the forms and their arrangement if I tilt my head from time to time.

(She went through all the steps I described earlier and carefully explained the importance of each as it led up to the final moment when the judgement was made.)

I: Then it's the objective and external arrangement of the lines that you judge, and the balance of colours and the unity of ...

(I thought perhaps she judged art objectively — just as Mr. B had wanted to.)

SHE: Oh, no. I don't know anything at all about that. It's a feeling that comes over me. It's delight in the line and colours. What one might call aesthetic delight. It's very personal and not easy to explain.

I: But the backing up, the circumambulation, the pre-judging ritual, what function does it serve?

SHE: It allows me to see the entire painting. It assures me of not missing one part of the canvas. But what makes it beautiful is the feeling in me and not just the arrangement on the canvas.

I: I suppose we could say that the beauty is in you, then, and not in the painting.

SHE: I don't know if I'd go that far, but I will say that without someone to see the painting it certainly wouldn't be beautiful.

I: What is this emotion like, then, or this feeling?

SHE: It's just a feeling of satisfaction and contentment with what I see. The painting causes me to feel pleasure and be delighted.

I: And when you feel this sensation the work is beautiful?

SHE: Of course.

I: And when you don't feel this sensation, the work is not beautiful? [She nodded.] But then the beauty can't be in the painting.

SHE: Why not?

I: Why, because if it were it would be beautiful even if no one were

around, and you said you didn't want to say that. [She looked perplexed.] Perhaps we could say the painting contains beauty-making properties and you perceive them, put them together and make a judgement as a result of perceiving these properties.

SHE: Yes, I believe that is correct.

I: And these properties are in the painting?

SHE: I suppose so, young man.

I: Then what are they?

SHE: All I know is I can feel when a painting is beautiful. How that feeling is characterized, I'm sure I don't know. You seem to ask an awful lot of questions for a judge.

I: I'm sorry if I do. But let me put just a few more questions to you. Have you ever experienced this aesthetic emotion or aesthetic delight at any other time than when you're looking at a work of art?

SHE: I'm afraid I don't know what you mean.

I: I mean to say, if your delight or pleasure could be achieved some other way, a drug, for example, or some other stimulant, would you judge the drug beautiful?

SHE: That would be silly; this delight is concerned only with painting and art: I enjoy art for this pleasure it gives me.

Thus far I have simply tried to point out two criteria for judging art. The art show and the people I met there characterized quite well these two distinct criteria. The first of these views states that there are formal elements in a painting that make it beautiful, irrespective of any viewer's presence, and that these formal properties alone are to be used in the judgement of any work of art: we can call this an *objective* criterion of art. The second criterion, the criterion actually of aesthetic pleasure, may be termed *subjective*, since the judgement of beauty depends solely on a feeling of delight or pleasure in the viewer.

The fact of the matter is that these two seemingly separate views of art are usually joined together in some symbiotic manner. The woman I spoke to above assented to this when she acknowledged that there were objective beauty-making properties in the painting upon which her subjective aesthetic delight depended. And the judge, Mr. B, hinted at a subjectivism in his objective approach when he accused Mr. A of being an "insensitive clod," implying, of course, that B himself was not and that sensitivity was just as necessary to judging beauty as the formal, objective properties. B also alluded to a "something more" in his objective criteria when he seemed to agree that terms such as "artistic emotion" and "aesthetic inspiration" have some meaning for the artist or

"creative genius," as well as for the viewer. Thus we might say that, judging from the use of this kind of language, subjective and objective criteria for beauty are very often mingled together in the mind of modern academic painters and their clientele.

From a stricter point of view, it seems to me that both of these aesthetic theories are inadequate. We have already pointed out that the objective theory broke down when our first aesthete, Mr. B, was asked if it would be possible to construct a work of art using the best of the formal properties from other art works, and whether, when the task of construction was over, we could then judge that new work beautiful. Mr. B denied that this was possible, for he wanted to maintain the thesis that the artist or the judge puts something else into the work — his sensitivity, for example — or sees "something more" in the work than merely carefully constructed formal properties. But if you cannot label a work as good because of the presence of formal properties alone, then the objective criterion of art is inadequate. If the identical formal properties make one art object beautiful at one time and another work not beautiful at another, then of what use can such a criterion for aesthetic judgement be?

For the other criterion the fact that the aesthetic emotion might be duplicated or surpassed with drugs or trances is no argument against the subjective theory really. But that a feeling or sensation of pleasure can be regarded as a criterion of art might indeed be worth analysis, and since the objective criterion of judgement is in a sense dependent on the subjective apprehension of formal properties it may be well to make a remark or two about this subjective apprehension and the theory behind it. The aesthetic emotion, whether aroused by identifiable or unidentifiable objective properties, is characterized as a feeling of pleasure which comes over the viewer when he is in the presence of a beautiful work of art. The emotion is enjoyed for its own sake without regard to usefulness or function outside of the aesthetic situation itself. In a sense, therefore, to say "This is a beautiful painting" is to say nothing more than "I like this painting." While formal properties may be pointed to in the work (beauty-making properties, let us say) the ultimate criterion is merely the titillation it affords to the viewer: and the judgement which follows. "I like the painting," is prone to all the criticism usually levelled at such subjective judgements.

For example, to state that beauty depends solely on my liking or disliking a work of art means that any work that has previously been judged great and beautiful by sensitive men of all ages must none the less await my liking it before it can *really* be beautiful: this is contrary to all common sense. Works can be and are judged great and beautiful even when

I am negatively or indifferently disposed to those works: the world of art just does not wait upon my moods; it did not before I was born, it will not after I am dead.

Furthermore, not only do we intuitively know that some works of art are beautiful even when we are negatively or indifferently disposed to them, but we also are inclined to like and show aesthetic approval to some works which we would not dream of calling beautiful, much less great. Some petty and insignificant work may titillate me and arouse my emotions so that I become fond of the work, but this does not mean that I would necessarily judge the work great or beautiful. In other words, I could say — and I have said, and without contradiction — "This work is beautiful but I do not like it. It does not move me," as well as "This work moves me, and I like it, but it is not beautiful." If the subjective theory were true, if subjective liking or pleasure or titillation were in some sense identical with or necessarily related to greatness or beauty, then I could not have said what I did without at the same time contradicting myself. But it is obvious, I think, that there is no contradiction in the above two assertions.

If the subjective theory of aesthetic judgement, and the objective theory in so far as it relies on the subjective theory, are both rejected as untenable, what criterion is there for judging a work of art? In Part II of this paper I want to turn to another type of aesthetic judgement and examine it in relation to the problem we have been dealing with here, viz.: How does one determine whether a work of art is beautiful?

ARTHUR L. HERMAN

(*To be continued*)

The Poet

Like some tall mountain towering above hills,
A giant among men, you stand alone,
Your thoughts are wandering clouds serenely blown
Whose beauty dazzles while it strangely chills,
Your words are rapturous nightingales whose trills
Are heard in gardens when the night has thrown
A veil of scented darkness, starry-sown
About the earth, and silence, listening, thrills;
Yours is the heart whose moods are like a sea,
Now tamed and still, and now tumultuous, wild;
You have the sea's unfathomed mystery,
Who gaze with childish wonder on a tree,
Who glimpse an aged wisdom in the child,
And find in restlessness tranquillity.

HERBERT BLUEN

H. SUNDER RAO

The Theme of Redemption in *King Lear*

[Shri H. Sunder Rao, M.A., has taught English literature for a long time and is now in retirement from a principalship. He writes with feeling in this thoughtful appreciation of what he sees as the central theme of *King Lear*, and he brings to bear on it a deeply felt sense of the nature of spiritual growth. The concept of such a growth through pain and sacrifice is common to all the great religious traditions.—ED.]

IN *King Lear* we come almost to the absolutes of suffering. Lear, particularly, who symbolizes Man, is a self-alienated outcast engaged in a stupendously painful exploration of what may be called the lost territory of his soul. The struggle is not only against a whole external universe of evil but also against the inner forces of darkness. The ultimate victory in this gruelling *sādhanā* is not therefore so much over external forces as over oneself. Tragedy, unless it ends in the discovery of truth, is purposeless. In *King Lear*, this discovery of truth has a tremendous significance. It is not the "truth" of facts or circumstances that Lear and Gloucester discover, but the basic truth about themselves. In Vedānta, the highest goal is self-realization or *Ātmānubhava*, the experience of the *Ātman* or the Self. It is also called *Ātma-jñāna* or self-awareness, a new insight that arises after all illusions are destroyed. In this sense *King Lear* is a tragedy of great spiritual meaning. At the end of the play we find one who is not only disillusioned but transfigured, not merely a repentant but a redeemed Lear. The truth that Lear (and to some extent Gloucester) discovers is about life itself — not something restricted to a particular situation, however distressing or diabolic, but embracing the entire universe, its basic laws, its very life and essence that form the foundation of its existence and validity.

H.P.B. in her *Isis Unveiled* says how when the curtain is lifted aside men can "look with undazzled gaze upon the unveiled Truth." He who has experienced the darkness behind the curtain is able to see the Light better. "To see the true light," says Meister Eckhart, "one must become blind and strip God naked of things." Unless men descend into the "lake of darkness" they cannot gain the light of wisdom. In Plato's *Phaedo* Socrates asks, "Is not everything born out of its opposite?" The divine succour comes to the fugitive in Francis Thompson's *The Hound of Heaven* only when he is smitten to his knee and his harness is hewn from him piece by piece and he is "charred" like a piece of wood in the furnace of despair and suffering. The process of self-knowledge is a gruelling one. The Lear of the first two Acts (and this is also true of Gloucester) is un-

doubtedly the unregenerate man that the *Gītā* describes in so many of its passages. He is self-absorbed, perversely self-willed, his vision clouded by vanity and pride. He is dominated by *Tamas* — total inward darkness. There is, no doubt, an element of barbaric splendour about him, but it is the forbidding majesty of a blind autocrat who will brook no opposition to his will. This is the starting point of his tragedy. In a way, too, Gloucester's tragedy is of a similar pattern. Both are blinded by egoism, *Ahaṁkāra*. Gloucester is led away by the lusts of the heart and Lear by the pride of his will. Gloucester's words "I stumbled when I saw" are some of the most significant in the play, because they show how it is inner blindness that drives the two unfortunate fathers to their sufferings. The play abounds in scenes and images of physical suffering. The scene of the blinding of Gloucester is perhaps a terrible symbol of some primitive, barbaric expiatory ritual, and is the culmination of his night of the soul, the blank, benumbing, darkened midnight moment of his agony. In spite of their age and experience, they are astonishingly lacking in what the *Gītā* calls *vyavasāyātmikā buddhi,* practical, worldly wisdom. Lear is especially so, "a massive fortress of pride." He misjudges and blunders, his vision is clouded by pride and self-love, and he banishes Cordelia. Gloucester too is weak, credulous, and full of self-love and is responsible for the exile of Edgar. Lear's anger, his violence of feelings, his tantrums and fiery curses against Cordelia, reveal his total lack of wisdom. "He hath ever but slenderly known himself." Throughout the unpleasant scenes which follow Cordelia's repudiation, when he is slighted, humiliated, and ill-treated by his two elder daughters to whom he had given his all, there is hardly any trace of restraint, balance, and understanding in the old King's behaviour. He is a super-egoist entirely occupied with his own self. He has hardly any inner resources of wisdom with which to face the truth of things. He only rants in unbridled anger. A famous passage in the *Gītā* says that when anger destroys wisdom, delusion, self-love, and pride arise and destroy man:

> *Krodhāt bhavati sammohaḥ, sammohāt smṛtivibhramaḥ,*
> *Smṛtibhraṁśāt buddhināśo, buddhināśāt praṇaśyati.*

In Lear's world, there is not a glimmer of understanding or compassion, nothing but steel-hard stubbornness directed solely towards self-gratification. Lear is a total stranger to the truths of the heart.

Lear and Gloucester pay heavily for their blindness. The Lear-Gloucester world is a loveless world reduced almost to a state of primeval horror. Lear is baited by his evil daughters. One by one his illusions fall away. The King is now an outcast and for the first time learns of the

limits of his authority. In the storm scenes, he learns another and more awful lesson, that in the presence of the tremendous powers of nature, he is nothing. He is a pathetic little creature subject like the rest of his fellow beings to the "will" of Nature. This is Lear's most memorable moment, even as the gruesome blinding scene marks the most critical moment of Gloucester's life. The discovery of truth is accompanied by unbearable physical suffering and mental agony. Even a King is mortal, a mere human being whose hands "smell of mortality."

This purgatorial suffering is a prelude to Lear's recovery. He who had known only the sovereignty of the will, slowly and painfully learns that there is another sovereignty — that of the heart. In the depth of agony, he glimpses the light of truth. He is reduced to absolute nothingness before the forces of "wholeness" begin to work. The battle of inner redemption is a fierce one. Sacrifice and pain are the price that one has to pay for victory in this struggle. In the nudity of the spirit men learn to see the truth. It is only when Lear is alone, thrown absolutely on his own resources, that he truly knows himself, and we witness the momentous meeting of the individual self with the Universal Self, of "God and Soul," to use the well-known words of St. John of the Cross. Both Lear and Gloucester (Lear more powerfully than Gloucester) pass through these tremendous transforming crises. The spiritual lucidity which they gain amidst their physical suffering is indeed significant. The storm scenes symbolize the ultimate *pralaya* or dissolution of the universe, picturing a world of total chaos, "all coherence gone," to use one of Donne's phrases. But the very chaos seems to give birth to inner clarity, a keener vision. It marks a new birth for them.

Shakespeare must surely have been aware of the immense transforming power of suffering on our lives. The cleansing of the spirit is not a casual, light-hearted "spring-cleaning." It is through misery that miracles are achieved. As Lear is baited, tortured in mind, and suffers in body in the cruel storm scenes, we see the first glimmer of patience in the ranting old man. It is through patience, through endurance, that man learns the reality of things. "You, heavens, give me that patience, patience I need." This is Lear's cry. The process of self-knowledge goes forward relentlessly even amidst the old man's furious outbursts and raving curses. As he wanders through the storm in "rain, thunder and fire," he begins to realize that he is only "a poor, infirm, weak and despised old man," and we note the piteous humility of his words. Yet in this state of absolute "nothingness" he becomes the symbol of the sorrow of Man. With this transformation, a new universe of values is revealed to him, values which in the days of his tyrannical power he had scarcely known. Sympathy,

patience, compassion, and humility are awakened in a heart from which he had banished these feelings in his days of kingship. Now he will be "the pattern of all patience." The vision of "poor naked wretches" with their "houseless heads and unfed sides" who have to bide the "pelting of this pitiless storm" fills him with compassion. "O, I have ta'en too little care of this," he cries. The vision of the "unaccommodated man" is like a revelation to him. It is a vision of man's utmost reality without any disguise, illusion, or palliation, a vision of the fundamental reality of all in which life itself is reduced to absolute nothingness. He learns the lesson of resigned acceptance. "He that endureth to the end shall be saved." Men must endure their "going hence" and "their coming hither" even as they must endure the trials and tribulations of existence. Only, they should be ready to face and endure everything — "ripeness is all." From the destitution of the body, Lear achieves the incalculable richness of the spirit. He gains "self-knowledge," a tremendous sense of clarity and perspective and insights deeper than anything he had experienced in his days of power.

This mighty rush of awareness cannot happen without the breakdown of the mind. But even in his madness, we see clearly his soul's progress. Lear's madness seems to make his utterance break through to a deeper imaginative level, to a profounder insight into reality. Sometimes the frontier between fantasy and insight is palpably frail. "They flattered me like a dog," he says, and how true his words are! He acquires an extraordinary power to probe into falsehood, pretence, and pomp. Lear's vision of universal corruption is an integral phase of his soul-education. The grotesque mummery of the trial scene tells us how much Lear has learnt about the world and its ways — its subterfuges, falsehoods, and treacheries, its undivulged crimes and hidden follies. Amidst the incoherences of his talk, the disjointed ravings of a deeply tortured soul, we catch the authentic accents of illumined truth. In a different way, Gloucester, too, gains this precious self-knowledge. He too has suffered, has been grievously injured and cruelly betrayed. The shock has almost destroyed his faith in the mercy of the higher powers. He is bitter and desperate:

> As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods
> They kill us for their sport.

When the two wronged fathers meet, it is Lear who seems to be the calmer and asks his fellow-sufferer to be patient. He is calm of mind, all passion spent, and his vision of truth is clearer. He has abandoned his petty egoism and has come nearer to truth — the truth of evil and the truth of compassion. He has yet to gain and experience the truth of love. Through love that is freely given, which does not bargain or make condi-

tions, the tortured fathers are restored to the "beauty and benison" of life from which they had banished themselves by their own egoism and spiritual blindness.

The journey's end is drawing close — Lear's reconciliation with Cordelia and Gloucester's with Edgar, who, loving and loyal and betrayed, chooses suffering and the state of the outcast to bring wisdom and comfort to his father. The final revelation of life's beauty and love's healing magic bring both Lear and Gloucester for a little while into the supreme paradise of peace and joy. Lear has a few hours of sanity with Cordelia and then a few last moments of supreme clear-sightedness and bliss. He is face to face with love at its purest and holiest. He and Cordelia are now like two birds trapped in a cage. But time is fleeting. We know that they are both on the brink of doom. Yet what exquisite moments of peace and happiness are theirs before the end! Lear's words in the last scene have the haunting beauty and power of a sacred incantation. He knows that on such sacrifices as he and Cordelia have made "the gods themselves throw incense." They are now "God's spies" — seers of truths they had never known, of visions of love and holiness they had hardly imagined. Life reaches its miraculous height even on the edge of death. Nothing else matters now to him who has seen the incomparable vision of truth, love, and beauty in his beloved daughter. And when she dies, his heart is broken and he passes beyond the rack of this tough world and this existence which has mostly been to him "cheerless, dark and deadly." But he has been enabled through intense suffering to look "with undazzled gaze upon the unveiled truth." So, too, Gloucester dies, his heart bursting smilingly at the great moment when he is united to Edgar and the truth of his banished son's love fills his being.

The end of *King Lear* is unique. There is neither triumph nor escape in such an end. It is a transcendence — "a rising above" — and as the play ends, a sense of exaltation fills us at the stupendous miracle by which the greatest suffering can become a means towards human salvation and transfiguration.

H. SUNDER RAO

The Egotist

I am the centre and circumference;
all others pale in my magnificence;
I'm always right in what I say or do:
Only mortal? Well, it may be true.

WILLIAM EWART WALKER

New Books and Old

"The Tenth Man"*

THE INTRIGUING TITLE of this work calls for a word of explanation. It is derived from the well-known story of the ten monks travelling together from one Master to another in search of enlightenment. Crossing a river in flood, they were separated by a swift current and, when they reached the other shore, they reassembled and one counted the others to make sure that all were safely across. Alas, he was able to count only nine brothers!

The contents of the book are perhaps as enigmatic as the title. They consist of short dialogues and aphoristic meditations which are by no means easy reading; but which nevertheless deserve careful study. Perhaps the book should be more often on the knee than in the hand. The one fundamental thought which recurs throughout the book and its predecessor volumes, *All Else is Bondage* and *The Open Secret,* is best expressed in one of the short meditations contained in the latter volume.

> What is the use of looking outside,
> All you will see is objects! Turn round and look within.
> Shall I then see subject instead?
> If you did you would be looking at an object.
> An object is such in whatever direction you look.
> Shall I not see myself?
> You cannot see what is not there!
> What, then, shall I see?
> Perhaps you may see the absence of yourself,
> Which is what is looking. It has been called "the Void."

The idea so clearly expressed in this passage is a semi-poetic rendering of the teaching of the famous *Heart Sutra,* which is memorized and daily repeated by practically all Buddhist Bhikshus of the Mahayana School. The author himself was at great pains to acknowledge this fact by devoting a whole section of *The Open Secret* to a consideration of the teachings of the *Heart Sutra* and a most illuminating interpretation of the famous *mantra* with which the Sutra closes: "*Gate, Gate, Parāgate, Parāsaṁgate, Bodhi Svāhā.*"

The present volume is according to the writer himself a restatement of the above fundamental truth. He makes this point absolutely clear in the opening words of his Foreword to the book:

> A reader who firmly believes that he can reach any satisfactory understanding of himself and his relation to the universe which apparently surrounds him *via* a self which he is conditioned to regard as an autonomous individual, is wasting his time in reading this book. He would need to be prepared to lay aside such a point of view and find that *as such* he has nothing but an apparent sentient existence that has no ultimate significance whatever, on account of the fact that he himself as a "fact" and a "self" does not exist at all.

How fundamental this idea is to an understanding of the book should be obvious from the fact that it is expressed in practically every other page of the book in a score of similes and aphoristic sayings. Here are a few examples:

> At any rate it is I who am looking for myself?
>
> *If you dial your own number on the telephone, will you get the connection?*
>
> Every sentient being, speaking as I, may say to his phenomenal self, "Be still! and know that I am God!"
>
> We do not love others, we *are* others.

---

* *The Tenth Man.* By WEI WU WEI. (Hong Kong University Press. 234 pp. 1066. HK $18.00)

The author breaks new ground in this book by emphasizing the fact that by our unbalanced system of education and upbringing we are conditioned from birth to identify ultimate Reality with the positive (*Yang*) element and overlook altogether the negative (*Yin*) element. He points out that the great religions — especially the Theistic religions — are specially prone to emphasize the positive qualities of God — his Love and Mercy and Justice. This way leads to a dualism which holds the mind in thrall and the only escape from it is the technique of the Negative Way which consists in the systematic negation of every positive psychic activity, thereby rectifying the imbalance which holds us in bondage. The mutual negation of all pairs of interdependent counterparts, of which positive and negative are the basic factors, is the result of compensation of the contrasting elements, each eliminating the other, leaving a blank which is known as Void, or better, Voidness. Ultimately, the author comes back to his central thesis that positivity is always affirmation of self and negativity negation of self. He quotes Ramana Maharshi's statement that liberation or *moksha* is annihilation of the Ego-sense.

Altogether this is a book which deserves the attention of every earnest and thoughtful reader. It is a book for the select few who are prepared to shed their intellectual prejudices and follow the author through his startling dialogues, expositions, and meditations. It is a book to be read carefully, thoughtfully, and prayerfully.

We salute the author on his superb achievement.

B. V. NARAYANA REDDY

A Review of Philosophy*

THIS BOOK could be called the philosophy of philosophy. The task Professor Burtt has set himself is so ambitious and his thinking so profound that the result is a book very difficult to epitomize, let alone to criticize, fairly in a brief review.

The first half of the book is a review of current systems and schools of philosophy, linguistic philosophy, Existentialism, and Marxism; their historical development; and the way in which their proponents' thought has developed and changed in recent years. Such change is due, the author argues, to the fact that the subconscious inevitably influences the conscious thinking of the philosophers, with the effect that what he calls their "basic propositions" are changed. I prefer the term "world picture" for that foundation upon which any logical philosophical system is built.

Professor Burtt argues from this that there can be no absolutes in philosophy; that its validity, like that of scientific truth, is subject to change as civilization progresses. I find this theory of relativity disturbing; for, while I am well aware of the evils that spring from dogmatic absolutism, it is difficult to see how any moral code of human conduct can stand upon so unstable a basis.

In the chapter on "Awareness, Truth and Communication," Professor Burtt writes:

> The most esoteric report in a scientific journal must be capable of translation into terms that any person who appreciates what science is about can comprehend, so far as concerns the essential discoveries reported.

Certainly, but it is even more important that philosophic arguments should be stated with clarity; hence the concern of the linguistic philosophers. But, for this reader at any rate, Professor Burtt fails to fulfil this essential condition in the first half of his book. His

* *In Search of Philosophic Understanding*. By EDWIN A. BURTT. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London. 329 pp. 1967. 30*s*.)

literary style and choice of words are such that they demand from the reader the utmost concentration to follow his closely reasoned argument. It would be a great pity if this discouraged the reader from persevering, for the concluding chapters are more lucidly written and of the greatest significance.

In apparent contradiction to his earlier thesis on the inevitability of relativity, the author finds an absolute to which he firmly nails his colours. Reduced to its simplest terms, this is the injunction "Love one another" or "Love thy neighbour as thyself," which the founders of all the great religions of the world have proclaimed. Professor Burtt demonstrates how such a positive approach to others acts as a potent force for good, in the relations between nations no less than individuals, by promoting a deeper understanding. He also shows how its opposite, the negative approach of fear and mistrust, can act as a self-fulfilling prophecy by engendering a like emotion in their object.

There is nothing new in this, but its cogent restatement is most heartening at a time when fear and mistrust have produced weapons so potent that they could destroy the world. Professor Burtt develops his argument by showing how a positive approach could produce a fruitful synthesis between Eastern and Western philosophies and between Communism and Western Democracy. As he sees it, modern communications and weapons have made such a "coming together" of mankind not only possible but essential. The alternative is death.

The validity of this thesis is beyond argument, but on one important question I find myself at odds. Professor Burtt appears to regard the material revolution wrought by science and technology as a certain and unqualified good. He speaks of automation as liberating man from ancient thraldom, whereas, if we apply to the worker in modern industry the insight which the positive approach of love can give us, should we not see that the remorseless drive towards greater efficiency and "productivity" lays upon him a psychological burden greater than the physical burden it has removed? Again, Professor Burtt uses the word "conquest" in relation to the power that man has won over the natural world. But conquest makes man arrogant. Is it not vital, if we are to survive as a species, to extend our love and understanding to embrace the natural world and to all living things within it?

L. T. C. ROLT

The Symphony of Life. By B. NATESAN. (Author, c/o *Kalki* Office, Madras. 42 pp. 1967. Re. 1.00)

Reading Shri Natesan's *The Symphony of Life,* one is reminded of what Cyril Scott, the well-known pianist and composer, once wrote in a useful treatise on health called *Simpler and Safer Remedies.* Mr. Scott observes:

> There is the ancient saying "Whom the gods love die young." Many people believe this to mean that geniuses die at an early age. But it seems that the original meaning was that those beloved of the gods retain their youth almost to the day of their death. It is certainly often the case with men of great talent that they continue to work hard all their lives, instead of retiring and resting on their laurels (if there are any) at a comparatively early age.

Shri Natesan is apparently one of those "whom the gods love." At a considerably advanced age, he finds life worth while; he is able to look back on a youth well spent in rewarding effort, trials cheerfully faced, problems bravely tackled, experiences eagerly sought, and the whole of life leavened by faith and a sensitive awareness of the loveliness that Nature provides. *The Symphony of Life* embodies his thoughts and reflections on life, as well as quotations from well-known authors with whom he is in agreement. It makes pleasant and absorbing reading and contains a message for the type of rootless and un-

rooted personality symbolic of our time, disinherited by history and by the pressures of a civilization in which wants are endlessly multiplied and have to be satisfied at the expense of peace and enlightened living.

Among the many happily chosen quotations the following reflect the author's robust optimism and philosophy of living:

> Say what one will about the vices and follies of man, how immense are his virtues! Think steadily, if you can, of the incredible things that he suffers — his hard toil, his struggle for bread and home, the smallness of his reward, his undeserved calamities, the slaughter of his affections, and through it all his indomitable spirit and courage as he gathers himself from the dust or the mire and plants his foot again on his rough and uncertain road. (J. A. SPENDER)
>
> When the day returns call us up with morning faces and with morning hearts, eager to labour, happy if happiness be our portion and, if the day be marked for sorrow, strong to endure. (R. L. STEVENSON)

HILLA C. VAKEEL

Zen — Way to Enlightenment. By H. M. ENOMIYA-LASSALLE. (Burns and Oates Ltd., London. 126 pp. 1967. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

Zen is in the fashion, but fashions have their uses, especially when an unusual slant of interpretation is involved. This is certainly so with the present volume, written by a German-born, English-trained Jesuit with over thirty years' experience in Japan as slum-worker, Hiroshima-casualty, lecturer, and director of Christian-Zen groups near Hiroshima. It is good that the West should read his acute, reasoned, yet fervent account of Enlightenment or *Satori,* whether this be a "super-conscious, intuitive cognition" or "a continuous perfection of man," whether it is an inner force, a diamond needing to be polished (the *Kai-go-zen* view) or not (*Tai-go-zen*). This blending of Buddhist-born Zen and (Catholic) Christianity is in tune with the oecumenical spirit, and indeed offers a valuable instance of using aspects of one religion as an adjective or function while another faith remains as a noun or substance. The author successfully rebuts possible Christian criticism, and quotes deeply from Christian mystical authors like Thomas Merton and Louis Gardet. He rightly suggests that "a connection with [a particular] religion is secondary" for either Zen or Yoga (p. 36), while portraying profoundly (Ch. III) the influence of Zen on the Japanese *dō* (ways) and the diverse religious approaches of Japanese and Westerners. Yet if "fencing and Zen are the same thing" (p. 59) when inspired by *mu-ga* (perfect self-control), cannot Zen and Japanese militarism or the bombing of Hiroshima be the same thing? Zen *without* Buddhism or the compassionate aspect of Christianity can prove vicious; neither are we enthusiastic about the violent facets of Zen training (here mentioned again). A useful chapter is the sixth, a practical guide to *Za-zen,* for Westerners, with details and illustrations on posture.

TERENCE WHITE GERVAIS

Mystic Approach to the Veda and the Upanishad. By. M. P. PANDIT. (Ganesh and Co., Madras. 127 pp. Second ed., 1966. Rs. 3.00)

This is a collection of occasional papers on the importance of the Vedas and the Upanishads from the point of view of mysticism, and provides an interesting and illuminating study. The Vedas are held to be divine truths revealed to the Vedic seers and sages from time to time, and are essentially spiritual in origin and development and in the imparting of instruction. The Vedic seers were mystics and the communion of the individual soul with the Supreme Soul is the consummation of mystic consciousness. The Absolute has

soul-hunger and the mystic has God-hunger, and when the two are united there is eternal bliss. Further, it has been the realization of the Vedic sages to recognize the existence of the One in many — they spontaneously conceived the existence of many spiritual entities embodying the One in sacrifices etc.

The Upanishads preserve the essentials of Vedic wisdom, revere the Vedic traditions, and constitute the "crown and the sum of the Veda." The sparks of philosophic light appearing in the Vedas shine gloriously in the Upanishads. They embody mystic wisdom in a perfect form.

K. E. PARTHASARATHY

The Psychology of Time. By PAUL FRAISSE. Translated by JENNIFER LEITH. (Eyre and Spottiswoode, London. 343 pp. 1964. 30*s*.)

Paul Fraisse, Professor of Experimental Psychology at the Sorbonne, has written a classic account of his subject. If it is read in conjunction with Dr. G. J. Witrow's *The Natural Philosophy of Time* (Nelson, London. 1961), the reader will obtain a unique conspectus of the modern Western conception of time, as approached from psychology and physics.

The book is divided into three parts.

Part I ("Conditioning to Time") deals, e.g., with physiological clocks (in man, far more accurate than conscious estimates) and also with conditioned reflexes (deferred, trace, and operant conditioning), which involve an ability to reproduce time sequences.

Part II ("The Perception of Time") discusses, *inter alia*, the unit of perception, which organizes, e.g., sounds, into groups of two or three. Hearing is the primary sense for time, as sight is for space. The threshold of time and the perception of duration are also given thorough treatment.

Part III ("Control over Time") starts with the statement that man has the great advantage over animals that he can form representations of changes other than those perceived in the present, and in this way can learn to control his environment. The "temporal horizon" enables man to retell a story and to form a project.

The sense of duration arises in man because time sets a barrier between desire and its satisfaction. It is only very gradually that an abstract notion of time comes to be formed.

Time is an irreversible process. It flows continuously from birth to death, and though we may become aware of it, we cannot halt it.

What, then, is the relation between time and eternity? Does not this, too, belong to the psychology of the subject? It is here that the one-sidedness of the modern Western conception becomes apparent.

Fraisse mentions the timelessness of the unconscious, but he sees this only through Freudian eyes, in terms of primitivity, madness, or mystical escape. This may be justified — up to a point. Yet there are more things in the unconscious of man than are dreamed of in Freud's psychology!

"Time is the mobile image of eternity," said Plato. The clock-face is itself a mandala or symbol of eternity, and the cosmic vision of the world-clock, which came to one of Jung's patients, seems to be concerned with this problem. Its three pulses or rhythms possibly represent three different time-scales, or dimensions of time. (See *Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, Vol. XI, p. 66, and Vol. XII, p. 194.)

We are all, in some sense, apprentices to time. And it is only, perhaps, after we have mastered our trade — which is to realize the eternal in the passing moment — that we may hope to understand the mysterious words spoken long ago, in another vision, by an angel: "*Il ne s'agit point du temps de là-bas, mais de l'éternité.*"

EUGENE ROLFE

Homage to Guru Gobind Singh. By KHUSHWANT SINGH and SUNEET VIR SINGH. (Jaico Publishing House, Bombay. 100 pp. 1966. Rs. 2.50)

This tiny paperback includes a Postscript, a long Appendix on the Guru's writings, and three Bibliographies. And yet within the eighty-five pages of actual text lies a vast research into history and a painstaking sifting of fact from fable.

Shri Khushwant Singh, well known as a historian of the Sikhs and translator of their sacred texts, gives most of the credit for the book to his young co-author, Kum. Suneet Vir Singh: "I have over-written the script prepared by her and added the preliminary chapter." This very preliminary chapter, "Sowing of the Seed," however, is the most inspired. Shri Khushwant Singh's modesty, I suspect, is characteristic chivalry towards a lady.

Lucidly and with authority Shri Khushwant Singh explains how and why Sikhism arose. Nanak (1469–1539), a Hindu shopkeeper who became the first Guru,

> belonged to the school of thinkers who believed that Hinduism and Islam could be fused into a common faith and the two people be persuaded to live in fraternal harmony. ... It was only when the conqueror-Muslims threatened to wipe out the Sikhs that the sixth Guru, Hargobind, and finally the tenth Guru, Gobind Singh, were compelled to re-orientate their attitude towards their oppressors. It is, however, noteworthy that no change was made in the basic faith of Nanak.

The tenth Guru, Gobind Singh, was born Gobind Rai, only son and successor to Guru Tegh Bahadur, in Patna, on 26 December 1666. He was a child of six when he was taken to Annandpur to see his father for the first time; he was only ten when Aurangzeb had his father beheaded at Delhi, and a brave disciple, Jaita the sweeper, brought away the head to him. "To him was posed the awful question: 'When evil is in the ascendent, should a good man knuckle under it or take up arms to combat and destroy it?' "

From a very young age, therefore, Gobind prepared himself for the task of making himself and his small band of Sikhs strong, in body, in spirit and resolve, and in arms. He spent his early years in the comparative seclusion of the wooded foothills of the Himalayas, building forts and strongholds against the enemy. Gifted with a keen mind, he learnt quickly, and was soon himself a writer, a poet, a scholar of Persian and Sanskrit, setting down his adventures and his views on a variety of subjects in Hindi and Gurmukhi. The more he looked at his people, he says in *Bacitar Natak*, the more he realized how cowed down they were and disunited. To meet the fanaticism of the old Moghul king, whose campaign of conversion by force was in full swing, one had to become a fanatic oneself.

The Guru's altogether magnetic personality brought him a tough little army of freedom fighters, dedicated and fierce on the battlefield and under prolonged siege. He had turned the Sikh into the Khalsa, "the pure." He received his own ordination from five selected brave disciples who were the first initiated as Khalsa, and became Gobind Singh. All his four sons were killed in battle or put to death by the Moghuls; every Khalsa man and woman was willing to make the same sacrifice.

At the age of forty-two Guru Gobind arrived at Nanded (in present-day Marathwada) to regather his forces. He had lost everything except his valiant spirit and his most loyal people. Aurangzeb had died; Bahadur Shah, a friend of the Guru in his younger years, sent special envoys to him in a gesture of friendship. But one day two Pathans managed to steal into the Guru's camp and, finding Gobind Singh alone in his tent after the evening *Rahiras* prayer, attacked him with their daggers. When he was dying of the wounds, his last act at Nanded

> was to open the *Granth,* put five coins and a coconut before it and bow to it as the eleventh and everlasting Guru of the Sikhs. "My spirit is merged into the Khalsa and the *Granth,*" said the Guru; "he who wants

to know my mind should read the *Granth*."

It was the dawn of 7 October 1708.

My compliments to Khushwant Singh and Suneet Vir Singh for their service and hours of labour. The *Homage* is history of a heritage of which we are today proud.

GOPI GAUBA

Paul Blanshard on Vatican II. By PAUL BLANSHARD. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London. 371 pp. Frontispiece. 1967. 36*s*).

Paul Blanshard, hard-hitting critic and commentator of the tough school of American journalism, has tilted many a lance at the Roman Catholic Church, especially in the United States, on the ground of its continuing medievalism and authoritarianism, which he finds incongruous with the ideals of American democracy. Present at many of the sessions of the Vatican Council of 1962–65, he sets his comment in the wider setting of events and tendencies before and after the Council and with special regard to the two leading personalities, Pope John, who began it and Pope Paul, who has the responsibility of continuing and containing what was set on foot.

What he writes fully supports his sense of having the great advantage of having no necessity to please anybody, with no infallible tradition to maintain or bureaucracy to appease. His criticism is a welcome antidote to over-optimism as to the benefits and values of the Council. He is anxious to be fair, though tending perhaps to the negative side and also displaying the disposition, all too common, of contrasting the worse elements in the system he criticizes with his own democratic ideal at its best. He rightly sees that the Council must not be seen in isolation. When the tip emerged at the surface the great mass of iceberg had already formed. Nor is he ignorant of the fact that his opinions are shared, more or less, by a large number of Catholics, for the most part less articulate. Having surveyed the Council from the standpoint of the principal theories under discussion he comes to the conclusion that, for better or worse, the Roman Church can never be the same again.

The fact that so many critical issues were openly ventilated represents great gain. In particular the reform in liturgical practice, the admission that the church may have erred, e.g., at the time of the schism of East and West and at the Reformation, the acceptance in principle of religious freedom, and the open commitment to social reform are signs of a new and true liberalism.

On the other hand there are certain issues, e.g., continuing opposition to birth control, reassertion of Catholic claims to public funds, continuation of papal autocracy, and of discrimination in mixed marriages, which suggest that any reformation of the twentieth century may be more specious than real. Certainly many Catholics, and others more friendly to Rome than Blanshard, would agree with him that the tilting of the balance as regards these typical issues in the next few years will give the answer.

MARCUS WARD

Anton Mesmer. By D. M. WALMSLEY. (Robert Hale, London. 192 pp. Illustrated. 1967. 25*s*.)

This is essentially a biography of Mesmer written by a man whose interest in mesmerism was first aroused by the hypnotic treatment of cases of shell-shock after the World War of 1914–18. Anton Mesmer was born in 1734 in a village near Lake Constance. He studied the humanities at the Jesuit University of Dillingen in Bavaria; then he proceeded to Ingoldstadt University and read science and languages. At twenty-five he entered Vienna University as a law student; after completing a year of

this course he enrolled as a medical student and at thirty-two qualified as a doctor.

He thus had a far broader base of learning than the average doctor of his day and it is not, perhaps, surprising that he looked far beyond the orthodox practice of eighteenth-century medicine. He propounded a theory of animal magnetism and by the application of this theory he produced many remarkable cures in patients who had been virtually given up by other doctors. He and his disciples practised in many of the capitals of Europe, but the work was centred in Paris. Opposition inevitably came from professional bodies and from individuals, and the work also suffered from the political unrest of the time.

Dr. Walmsley relates Mesmer's life-story clearly and without prejudice and the book is well indexed and provided with a Bibliography, so that it can be used by students. In his final chapter Dr. Walmsley shows how Mesmer laid the foundation for much that is accepted in psychosomatic medicine today. This story can give new heart to those working in the difficult field of present-day fringe medicine.

PHYLLIS G. CROFT

Animals in Splendour. By E. L. GRANT WATSON, with 21 drawings by SVEN BERLIN. (John Baker, London. 154 pp. Illustrated. 1967. 30*s*.)

This new book of Mr. E. L. Grant Watson's has an unfailing fascination and is often deeply moving. The fascination comes from his profound knowledge of the animals of which he writes; it is the fascination we find in the writings of Fabre and Hudson, of any naturalist whose investigations begin, continue, and end in that wonder at natural phenomena which is itself the beginning of religion. For there in turn, in this writer's visionary understanding of his subject, which he makes us share with him, lies the quality in the book which moves us.

Ecology, in a word, is religion; for religion, Blake said, is brotherhood, and likewise he said that "everything that lives is holy." Mr. Grant Watson's achievement is to remind us, in a day and age in which we too often forget it, first, that we ourselves belong to the animal kingdom, and then that we are interdependent with all the other species which go to compose it; and then again that, if we deny those other species their "original splendour," and their right to it, we deny those things to man; for wherever man exterminates his fellow creatures or puts them to base uses, it is himself that he diminishes.

When these things are said by a naturalist of profoundly philosophic and religious insight, and said at once in terms of myth, of folklore, of the residual country wisdom persisting even in these times, and of natural science, ecological law is not only rediscovered; it is transformed into the Law of God. That, in brief, is what this remarkable book is about, and what gives it its necessity and its own splendour.

Unfortunately, the illustrations by Mr. Sven Berlin are neither necessary nor splendid. They are pleasing enough as drawings, and interesting as a sculptor's drawings, but they are merely drawings of individual creatures, not of the archetypal creatures, alive in the Eternal Mind, of which Mr. Grant Watson, with his peculiar powers of vision, writes in the text. We could have done without them as its accompaniment, especially since we must suspect that it is their inclusion which makes the price of that text so high.

R. H. WARD

Akalaṅka's Criticism of Dharmakīrti's Philosophy. By NAGIN J. SHAH. (L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad. ix+316 pp. 1967. Rs. 30.00)

Dharmakīrti of the seventh century was an astute logician and an able philosopher. Not only in the field of Buddhist logic, but in the different schools

of Brahmanical and Jaina philosophy, his stimulating influence was powerfully felt. There was a crop of brilliant, original and mighty thinkers in India during that period, systematizing earlier traditions, proposing new theories, and refuting rival stands. Bhartṛhari, the grammarian; Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and Prabhākara in Mīmāṁsā; Uddyotakara in Nyāya; Śaṅkara, the Vedāntic Ācārya; and Akalaṅka, the Jaina philosopher, are some outstanding names in the period A.D. 600–800. Despite their different views, all these able thinkers are concerned with common problems of philosophy and use the same methodology of logical debate. They discuss one another at length, and a close study of this aspect is important for a proper understanding of these thinkers. But this is an aspect very much ignored by scholars of Indian philosophy; and we therefore welcome heartily the present study which attempts a comparative and critical study of the Buddhist philosopher Dharmakīrti and the Jaina philosopher Akalaṅka.

Dharmakīrti's philosophical acumen and intellectual powers, of which he was very self-conscious, are brought out in a verse from his *Pramāṇaviniścaya* quoted in full by Ānandavardhana in his *Dhvanyāloka*: *lāvaṇyadraviṇavyayo na gaṇitaḥ* ... . He metaphorically regards his work as a daughter matchless in beauty but pining for want of a suitable match. Dr. Shah has shown that Akalaṅka, the Jaina logician, was certainly a match for Dharmakīrti both in polemical skill and in philosophical temper.

Though we have the monumental work of Stcherbatsky on Buddhist logic, Jaina logic has not attracted the attention of scholars to the same extent. The present thesis, approved for a doctorate in Sanskrit by the Gujarat University, is thus original in subject as well as in treatment.

The work is divided into three parts. The first part, which is introductory, surveys the evolution of philosophical views, from the earliest beginnings to the time of Dharmakīrti and Akalaṅka, on the problems of permanence and change, universals, subjectivistic and idealistic tendencies, and *pramāṇas*, viz., perception, inference, and testimony. Against this background, Dharmakīrti is presented as the main target of Akalaṅka's criticism. The second part is concerned with the main problems of metaphysics: the criterion of reality, problem of universals, and Idealism *vs.* Realism. The third part examines the conclusions of these thinkers on the problems of epistemology and logic, viz., *pramāṇas* under *pratyakṣa, anumāna,* and *śabda.*

All the chapters first state the problem in general, then present Dharmakīrti's position as well as Akalaṅka's refutation of the same in detail, and afford, finally, general estimates. The original Sanskrit sources on which the presentation is based are fully set out in the footnotes. The author has succeeded in disentangling the admittedly abstruse thought-structure of Dharmakīrti and in presenting the Jaina standpoint succinctly. His estimates show that he is as often critical of Dharmakīrti as of Akalaṅka himself and is not prejudiced.

The volume will be welcomed by all advanced students of Indian logic, embodying as it does a clear and lucid exposition with modern philosophical terminology. We congratulate the author on his success in a very difficult undertaking.

K. KRISHNAMOORTHY

Upeya-Nāma-Viveka (*Nāmārtha-Viveka*) of UPANIṢADBRAHMAYOGIN. Ed. by V. RAGHAVAN. (The Adyar Library Research Centre, Madras. 56 pp. 1967. Price not mentioned)

The *Upeya-Nāma-viveka,* edited by Dr. V. Raghavan (with a Foreword by H.H. Shri Jayachamaraja Wadiyar), is a treatise on *Nāmasiddhānta.* According to it, the recitation or singing of the Lord's name is the easiest and the most efficacious path to Liberation. In sing-

ing the Lord's name, no distinction is to be made between one kind of Divine Name and another, *Śiva, Hari,* or *Rāma* (nevertheless, the *Upeya-Nāma-Viveka* gives special significance to the recitation of *Rāma-nāma*). The recitation of the Lord's Name is the *Upāya,* the means, but the same name also constitutes the *Upeya,* the end, viz., realization of the identity between the Supreme and the individual soul. The whole of humanity, irrespective of caste, colour, or stage of life, *varṇa* and *āśrama,* can chant the Lord's name.

Nāmasiddhānta may be described as a singing religion: *kīrtana* is one of the nine kinds of *bhakti,* and is one of the modes of obtaining divine grace. The *Nāmasiddhānta* school had a great influence on the rise of the devotional movement in the north and the south of India; in South India, it has a bearing on the art of South Indian music.

N. A. NIKAM

The Tragedy of Viet Nam

The tragedy of Viet Nam shows that revolutionary forces can turn to civil war, and civil war can lead to outside intervention, and intervention can lead to an ever-widening arena of conflict with the spectre of the H-bomb looming as the ultimate debacle — all this unless the forces of change are channelled into constructive courses.

Such is the final assessment, after an analytical study of the cognate causes of the festering sore that is Viet Nam, by a team of Quakers who visited the scene of struggle, suffering, and sorrow some months ago, in their report, *Peace in Viet Nam.** These constructive courses, however, they add further, must decondition first the fallacy of the *Pax Americana* — that the United States can determine the course of the whole world, either through military power or economic power. For their own history is a striking testimony to the danger of entering into "entangling alliances" for the sake of winning national independence.

The report then suggests certain wide possibilities for achieving peace in Viet Nam. Some of these are: (i) a general cease-fire for all parties, supervised by an international body to keep order and prevent reprisals; (ii) a Geneva-type conference to encourage Saigon and the National Liberal Front to reach agreement on the formation of a Viet-Namese Provisional Executive to maintain temporary administration of South Viet Nam and take measures necessary for the establishment of a provisional agreement; (iii) demobilization of armed forces on both sides and the withdrawal from South Viet Nam of all outside forces, both North Viet-Namese and American, under the surveillance of the international presence; and (iv) an international agreement guaranteeing Viet Nam's neutrality and its freedom from any outside interference.

Underlying these steps would be of course the broader objectives — the achievement of universality of membership in the United Nations and the development of accepted processes for the achievement of security through peaceful settlement, peaceful change, and the promotion of human rights.

G. M.

---

* *Peace in Viet Nam.* Report prepared by the American Friends Committee. (Hill and Wang, New York. 1966. 95 cents)

Ends and Sayings

"... ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers."

—SAMUEL BUTLER: *Hudibras*

The B. P. Wadia Memorial Meeting: 1967 was held under the joint auspices of the Indian Institute of World Culture, the P.E.N. All-India Centre, and the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom on 19 August 1967 at Theosophy Hall, Bombay. It was a symposium headed "World Problems Today" and Dr. P. B. Gajendragadkar, Vice-Chancellor, University of Bombay, and former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, was in the Chair. He opened the meeting with a tribute to the late Shri B. P. Wadia as a universal man, quoting from Shri Wadia's own writings and *The Voice of the Silence*. He referred to the many aspects of Shri Wadia's life-work — his initiation of the Labour Movement in India, his work for Home Rule, and his later years of work for the United Lodge of Theosophists. Dr. Gajendragadkar noted especially that Shri Wadia had always taken as a foundation the spiritual truths on which he explicitly concentrated in his later years. Dr. Gajendragadkar quoted particularly a passage from an early address to the first labour Union in India which urged upon the workers that all their claims rested finally on the divine presence in them as in all men.

The symposium comprised three talks: "International Relations and Peace"; "International Action for Education and Prosperity"; and "Understanding between Races and Cultures."

Dr. Aloo Dastur, Head of the Department of Civics and Politics, University of Bombay, examined very realistically and accurately the state of international relations. The imperfect peace we had at the moment, she considered, was negative in the sense that it was actuated by fear of the consequences of nuclear war. A positive peace would have to involve other and maturer attitudes. The situation, however, offered hints of directions in which desirable development was possible. There was an international forum, the U.N., which contained the potentialities of becoming a world conscience. In fact on some occasions it had acted as such, e.g., in the Suez crisis. Within it nations that were small in an economic and military sense were nevertheless able to make themselves felt to some extent, and this could develop into a healthier system of international relations. She referred to the importance of education in producing a real, positive kind of peace.

Professor A. B. Shah took up the theme in his talk on "International Action for Education and Prosperity." Since education is the foundation of prosperity, Professor Shah did not dwell especially on the financial or purely economic aspects of international aid. He concentrated upon the value of education for understanding and with many examples pointed out how much less is being done in that respect than might be. He referred especially to India's comparative neglect of educational exchange and co-operation with the Asian and African countries. In some ways this could be more important than educational exchange with advanced Western countries, since our problems resemble more those of the Asian and African countries.

Shri R. P. Sirkar, speaking on "Understanding between Races and Cultures," distinguished between racial and cultural differences. Racial differences, sociologists and anthropologists had shown, were superficial and concerned only with minor physical characteristics. Colour was not even a racial fact; for all possible colours of the human skin were produced by different combinations of the same chemicals,

combining with the pinkish blood vessels showing through. Albinos were the same in all races — resulting from the deficiency of these chemicals. Prejudices and misunderstandings as between any social groups, therefore, were cultural facts, i.e., they were passed on to children by adults, and never instinctive or natural. Nevertheless, little could be gained by attacking a culture frontally for its tendencies to discrimination. Far better results were likely to be obtained by drawing the thinking of a culture back to the universals which are present, as a matter of sociological fact, in all cultures. For example, the experience of White and Negro American soldiers in the last war showed that understanding and friendship were the result of working together on some worth-while purpose. The insight to aim at was that all groups contained very similar human beings, and this demanded an accurate knowledge of the culture which one was trying to reform. Much of Shri Wadia's work, for example through THE ARYAN PATH, was to bring about a comparative study of religions, philosophies, and sciences.

Dr. Gajendragadkar summed up with admirable exactness the points brought out and hoped that such ideas would be acted upon.

Dr. Jal F. Balsara moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman and the speakers.

Idealists often look upon the provision of more leisure for workers as a desirable aim. Undoubtedly too much work today is stultifying and monotonous. Yet a survey made towards the end of 1965 by the British Travel Association, Keele University, and the Gallup Poll, and recently published, shows, surprisingly enough, that

> 48 per cent of the population are satisfied with their present amount of leisure time, 12 per cent would sacrifice present leisure for more income, 14 per cent are sometimes at a loss for something to do and 4 per cent would like less leisure (*The Guardian,* 20 July 1967).

The dichotomy between work and play is coincidentally dealt with by Gavin Ardley in the Journal of the Royal Institute of Philosophy (*Philosophy,* July 1967). He brings the philosophy of Plato to bear on the role of play. Like the Indian philosophers, Plato always sought to reconcile the pairs of opposites, uniting the dualism of "playful — serious." Mr. Ardley works this out in a lively and lucid manner. The true philosopher, who mingles seriousness and gaiety, has an inner serenity, mental equipoise, and self-sufficiency. The sophist, with his intellectual pride, is, according to Plato, "the primordial evil genius of mankind" at the two extremes — the inflexible "serious" doctrinaire or the frivolous chameleon type. The man of equipoise sees work and play as one. For others work is considered serious, with interludes of non-serious play. Thus both "lose their savour." It is a disease of sophisticated societies, from which "primitive" men who see work as play, ritual movements, worship, are free.

> Dualisms appear when the perspective is foreshortened and reversed. The dualism of play and serious, the dualism of matter and mind, the cosmic dualism of good and evil principles, the seventeenth-century divorce of appearance and reality, and indeed all systematic bifurcations, seem to be products of contraction and inversion.

Plato's cave allegory represents the conversion — the turning round, the letting go of pride, the recognition that life is no barren dichotomy, but a fruitful polarity of a positive-negative principle (male-female) from which, in love, is brought forth wisdom.

Another point made by Mr. Ardley shows Plato's affinity with the Hindu *Bhagavad-Gītā*. The latter inculcates disinterestedness, reconciling renunciation of action and devotion through action. Plato links games with philosophy because they must both be played for love, not for competitive results. The man who maintains the balance of "playful — serious" is in the world, like one who loves it, yet is not of the world.

(The article has many other felicities, and deserves attentive reading.)

We can take the pointers presented so ably by Mr. Ardley, and apply them to healing the dualisms that afflict State and society. Reform must begin with the right ideas and attitudes inculcated by all who may broadly be termed "educationists," who set the tone and give the values. These values must be taken into account by those who administer the State and society, then implemented by industry and commerce, and finally by the workers themselves (the four fundamental natural "castes"). Then it will be recognized that the wealth-power-prestige syndrome is a symptom of an imbalance of "serious," just as the cult of the "flower-people," the "hippies," the drug-takers, and others who opt out of the collective responsibilities of life for an individual state of euphoria, marks an equal imbalance of "play."

With the breakdown of most of the former religious authority, the need for moral values, without attachment to any special religious or secular body, becomes evident. The question "Can moral values be taught at school, and in what way?" is currently engaging the attention of the Farmington Trust research group, sponsored by the Department of Education of Oxford University. Kay Evans (*The Observer,* 30 July 1967) describes its team as comprising a philosopher, John Wilson; a sociologist, Dr. Barry Sugarman; and a psychologist, Norman Williams. Following the example of Confucius ("First define your terms"), they have searched for a definition of morality on which all their members, whatever their persuasion, could agree — "The extent to which people feel a concern for the interests of others, commit themselves to a general principle of respecting them, and so act."

The way in which pupils' value-attitudes are determined by the school they attend is being investigated; a questionnaire involving nearly 1,000 State pupils, from kindergarten to leaving age, is being compiled, in order to discover their views on "good" and "bad." The ideal aimed for is that pupils should learn themselves how to make moral judgements. In order to encourage cross-fertilization between the Trust and the schools, a curriculum development centre is being set up in Oxford by the Schools Council.

It is good to get away from the attitude of referring to "Christian ethics" or the morals of any other creed as though they were unique, since they are the same in all religions, from the primitive to the most profound. The central core and heart of morality does not depend on external conditioning factors, but on knowledge of what we really are. One could wish the team would examine the concepts of reincarnation and *Karma,* which furnish a logical, and, when properly understood, satisfying, ideational foundation for true morality.

It is popularly said when the sky is covered with grey rain clouds that it will clear if there is only enough blue sky showing "to make a pair of Dutchman's trousers." To anyone viewing with distress the dark oppressive storm clouds, with their threats of torrential downpours, spreading over the world's racial atmosphere, anything that seems like a patch of blue is welcome.

Peter Schirmer, writing from Johannesburg, South Africa (*Sunday Times,* 30 July 1967) gives hope that, despite the stringent operation of apartheid still active, present breaks and new possible alignments between the various political parties might

> with luck and a bit of Opposition pressure lead to the abandonment of apartheid as known today and a more realistic approach to relationship between South Africa's varied racial groups.

The Nationalists built up the pattern of apartheid, but if the present moderate members of the party (including the Premier, Mr. John Vorster) continue to break with the extremists of the Right wing, and link with the Opposition

United Party, it may mean the formation of a new Right wing, all together making a strong government of a moderate character. A plan being prepared by the United Party in the hope of this outcome proposes to add to the two upper houses of government a multi-racial "Council of Communities" as a third one, whose members, elected by their own races, would have powers of veto and other rights.

This could mean the end of many of the country's apartheid laws which the Opposition have always claimed to be totally unnecessary. Removal of these would not only ease much hardship among non-whites, but would also help to improve South Africa's already tarnished overseas image, one of the main concerns today of most moderate Nationalists.

It is profoundly to be hoped that this "blueprint" for a greater measure of brotherhood and justice will become a viable proposition, without too much hindrance from fanatics, whether foes or over-zealous friends.

Pioners in Co-partnership

THOUGH the co-operative movement is generally associated with distribution, an interesting aspect is found in Britain in co-partnership housing. Despite all the tall-block buildings ("filing-cabinets" for humans) and planned estates, whether of local authorities or commercial firms, there is need for the "mutual aid" of tenants' housing associations. Co-partnership has been linked with the ideal of a "garden" village, city, or suburb, offering healthful amenities as well as a home. The pioneer work begun in Ealing, on the west of London, was chiefly due to Henry Vivian (1868–1930), a trade-unionist carpenter. The Ealing Local History Society relates (Members Papers No. 8) the story of *Ealing Tenants Ltd.: Pioneers of Co-partnership* to the movement as a whole.

Margaret Tims, herself an Ealing resident, has collected the facts lovingly, and her skilfully concentrated survey is an example of how local history can be written, not as a limited topic, but to throw light on the total scene. Its roots lay in such projects as Robert Owen's model industrial community (*c.* 1800) and the various well-intentioned if not always happy schemes of the mid-century for providing working-class dwellings. But Ealing Tenants Ltd. (1901), with its gardened red-brick houses and tree-lined roads, set the pattern for a co-ordinated creative environment (far different from "soul-less" planning), a pattern whose influence spread through the country and even overseas. Its history, struggles and achievements, and the benefits gained from the principle of sharing are set out clearly. Though the present Housing Corporation, established by the 1964 Housing Act, is intended to encourage the self-help housing societies, the prevailing idea that there is as yet insufficient experience in the techniques of group-ownership needs correcting, since Ealing Tenants Ltd. proved that its principles and practice were viable, and Miss Tims hopes that the history of its example will revive the awareness of this vital social philosophy.